This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

WIDENER
HN TBXD /

CP 143.33

HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

VE RI
TAS

Gift of the
PUBLISHER

THE

UNITARIAN,

AND

FOREIGN RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

THE

UNITARIAN,

AND

Foreign Religious Miscellany.

DEVOTED TO THE EXPLANATION AND DEFENCE OF THE PRINCIPLES OF UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY.

"Read—not to contradict ~~confute~~, nor to believe, and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse; but weigh and consider."—LORD BACON.

Selected by Rev. George E. Ellis.

VOLUME I.

BOSTON:
JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY,
No. 134 WASHINGTON STREET.
1847.

CP145.35

1858. April. 5.
Gift of
The Publishers.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
SEP 10 1979

1636
51

CONTENTS.

PAGE

NUMBER I.

PROSPECTUS 1
WHAT IS UNITARIANISM? 3
THE OLD TESTAMENT 17
A FEW WORDS ABOUT WAR 29
THE PRIMROSE 35

NUMBER II.

THE OLD TESTAMENT (CONCLUDED) 37
SELECTIONS 53
REVIEW OF PARKER'S DISCOURSE 49
BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY . . . 54
POLITICAL PIETY 66
FUTURE LIFE 72

NUMBER III.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF UNITARIANS 73
THOUGHTS ON THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN . . 81
BIBLICAL ASTRONOMY 90

POETRY. THE JOYFUL MESSAGE 93
NOYES'S TRANSLATIONS 94
MODERN ORTHODOXY 102
POETRY. THE VOICE OF GOD 108

NUMBER IV.

AN ESSAY ON PRIMÆVAL HISTORY 109
CONGREGATIONAL PSALMODY 123
THOUGHTS ON THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN . . 124
REVIEW OF WILSON'S UNITARIANISM . . . 133
LEARNING OF THE CLERGY IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY 137
WHAT ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY SHOULD BE . . 144

NUMBER V.

THE EDUCATION QUESTION 145
THOUGHTS ON THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN . 150
REVIEW OF WILSON'S UNITARIANISM . . . 161
MANCHESTER COLLEGE 165
DESIGNED EFFECTS OF CHRISTIANITY . . . 168
SELECTIONS 178
BIGOTRY CURED 179
POETRY. THE GOOD SAMARITAN . . . 180

NUMBER VI.

THE LITERARY HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT . 181
EXTRACTS FROM GERMAN JOURNALS . . . 186
RENUNCIATION OF ORTHODOXY 190
GLEANINGS REGARDING RONGE . . . 191
CONTROVERSY ON NATIONAL EDUCATION . . . 197
CALL OF ABRAHAM 200
THE OXFORD CONVERTS TO POPERY . . . 201
AMERICAN SLAVERY 202
THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE 207
ELEVATION OF THE EDUCATOR . . . 211
RENUNCIATION OF TRINITARIANISM . . . 214
THE MOSAIC CONSTITUTION 215

NUMBER VII.

IRELAND AND THE POTATO DISEASE 217
BIOGRAPHY AND JOHN MILTON 222
GERMANY 235
LINES 241
AMERICAN SLAVERY 242
MORE LIGHT 247
LADY HEWLEY'S CHARITY CASE 248

NUMBER VIII.

THE PEACE SOCIETY 253
CRITICAL NOTICE 261
RONGE AND THE NEW REFORMATION 275
STATE OF RELIGION IN GERMANY 278
LITERARY EXTRACTS.
THE ARABS 285
REFUSAL OF FUNERAL RIGHTS TO NONCONFORMISTS 287

NUMBER IX.

MAN'S ENMITY TO GOD 289
THE ALMANACS 304
WHY THEOLOGIANS DISPARAGE REASON 310
INTELLIGENCE.
"SPIRITUAL STATISTICS" 311
DR. VAUGHAN ON GEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE . 312
THE POPE 317
RELIGIOUS ELECTIONEERING 319
EXTRACT 322
POETRY 323

NUMBER X.

A RETROSPECT 325
BRITISH ANTI-STATE CHURCH ASSOCIATION . . 336
UNITARIANISM AND TRINITARIANISM AS THEY WERE AND AS THEY ARE 345
CREED OF UNITARIANS 351

THOMAS CLARKSON 354
POETRY 356
KING CHARLES THE MARTYR 357
DOUBT 359
THE DYING FLOWER 360

NUMBERS XI & XII.

STATE OF RELIGION IN GERMANY 361
LETTER FROM THE LATE DR. PARR 372
CRITICAL NOTICES 375
POETRY 386
INTELLIGENCE.
THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON 387
THE FAST DAY 390
INTOLERANCE IN CHESHIRE 392
RELIGIOUS ENDOWMENTS 396
ASPLAND'S SERMONS 401
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON 414
LOVE OF THE BEAUTIFUL AND GOOD 416
SUMMER 418
THE EDUCATION CONTROVERSY 419
INGRATITUDE 423
A WORD MORE ON THE FAST 424

THE

UNITARIAN,

And Foreign Religious Miscellany.

DEVOTED TO THE EXPLANATION AND DEFENCE OF THE PRINCIPLES OF UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY.

THE periodical work of which this is the first number, and which will henceforth be published monthly, will contain a selection from the English Unitarian publications of such of their contents as will be most interesting on this side of the water. Our brethren in Great Britain now sustain with talent and ability one quarterly, three monthlies, and one weekly publication, engaging the help of the most vigorous writers, and containing literary and religious essays, reviews, articles of intelligence, &c. But few copies of either of these publications are taken in this country. Some of their contents are of merely local and temporary interest, relating to measures and things in which we have no concern, and unintelligible to American readers in general unless accompanied with comments. But in nearly every number of each of these works, there is one or more articles, which, as explanatory of a pure Christianity, or as indicating the condition, efforts, and prospects of our brethren, or as bearing upon the great

common enterprises of our times, derives an added value for us from its Transatlantic origin. It was at first proposed by the publishers to reprint the small monthly magazine called the "Unitarian;" but as that work necessarily devotes a portion of its pages to matters of merely local interest, it was thought advisable to select from it in connexion with the other publications.

The Prospective Review, published quarterly, contains articles of great merit for scholarship, for philosophy and literary and religious criticism. Some of these, however, are so long, that it may occasionally be necessary to divide them when inserted in these pages. Whenever this is done the whole article will appear in consecutive numbers, without abridgment or alteration.

The Monthly Reformer, the Bible Christian, and the Unitarian, are the names of the three monthly publications. There is great variety in their contents, though they are all devoted strictly to the interests and views of Unitarians. We have often perused pieces in these works in which it has occurred to us that many readers among us would find interest and gratification.

The Inquirer is a weekly newspaper, edited with signal ability by Rev. Mr. Hincks, and enriched by the pens of many correspondents.

These several works will afford abundant materials for the project now commenced, the success of which we now leave to be decided on its own merits.

THE

UNITARIAN.

WHAT IS UNITARIANISM?

It is not Deism. It is not Socinianism. And yet it has suited, and, we regret to say, still suits, the purpose of some parties to represent it as either the one or the other. It is our aim to set forth in a few pages the leading doctrines and views of Unitarian Christianity, so that the reader may be put in possession at once of its characteristic tenets and principles; he will then be able to judge for himself how far the representations of those who speak of it as Deistical or Socinian, are founded in truth or fact.

We will not say that our exposition will be consonant with the views and conscientious belief of *all* Unitarians, because they differ among themselves; but that the following are the religious opinions of the far greater portion of that calumniated body of Christians we think we may undertake to affirm. But let it be fully understood, that we here intend merely to state what *are* the doctrines of the Unitarians, not the *arguments* on which those doctrines are founded.

A Deist professes to follow no particular religion, but merely acknowledges the existence of God. The Unitarian, on the other hand, believes in both the Old and the New Testaments, on the latter of which his principles are founded, inasmuch as he receives the several books which compose that volume, the Histories and the Epistles, as the record of a religion revealed

from Heaven through Jesus Christ, for the guidance and comfort of mankind here, and their salvation hereafter. Thus, then, the Unitarian believes in *revelation*, both the Jewish and Christian; that is, he believes them both to rest on a *supernatural* foundation. In Jesus of Nazareth he confesses a teacher commissioned and sent by God; the founder of a religion which God appointed him to convey to man; the Messiah, inspired with divine wisdom, and qualified and enabled by the performance of numerous and undeniable miracles, to lay the foundation of the everlasting kingdom of righteousness, the kingdom of God and of his Anointed. The writings of the New Testament the Unitarian receives as a collection of books, faithfully written from what they saw and heard, by the immediate disciples of our Lord. And these books he accepts as the best gift of God to man; he would endeavor to live according to their precepts; he would gladly die by them in the blessed hope of an immortality as well grounded and sure, as the universe itself.

Thus receiving the whole Bible as containing the accounts of two distinct revelations of God to man — the one addressed to the Jews and adapted to the childhood of the human race, the other intended for all mankind — the Unitarians have ever been among the most learned and zealous and satisfactory defenders of the Sacred Volume from the insults of its impugners. Yet do they not regard it with a blind, credulous, superstitious reverence. They do not take every word and verse in the sense that might first present itself to an ignorant, uncultivated reader. They endeavor to understand the true sense by the employment of all those means legitimately resorted to in the interpretation of any other book of like antiquity. And this brings us to the question of the principles of Scriptural interpretation adopted by the class of Christians in whose name we write; which principles are so well expounded by the pious and eloquent Dr. Channing, that we cannot do better than quote his words:

"Our leading principle in interpreting Scripture," says he, "is this, that the Bible is a book written for men, in the language of men, and that its meaning is to be sought in the same manner as that of other books. We believe that God, when he speaks to the human race, conforms, if we may so say, to the established rules of speaking and writing. How else would the Scriptures avail us more than if communicated in an unknown tongue?

"The New Testament is built on the Old. The Christian dispensation is a continuation of the Jewish, the completion of a vast scheme of Providence, requiring great extent of view in the reader. Still more, the Bible treats of subjects on which we receive ideas from other sources besides itself, such subjects as the nature, passions, relations, and duties of man; and it expects us to restrain and modify its language by the known truths which observation and experience furnish on these topics. We profess not to know a book which demands a more frequent exercise of reason than the Bible. We find that the different portions of this book, instead of being confined to general truths, refer perpetually to the times when they were written, to states of society, to modes of thinking, to controversies in the Church, to feelings and usages which have passed away, and without the knowledge of which we are constantly in danger of extending to all times and places, what was of temporary and local application. We find, too, that some of these books are strongly marked by the genius and character of their respective writers; that the Holy Spirit did not so guide the Apostles as to suspend the peculiarity of their minds; and that a knowledge of their feelings, and of the influences under which they were placed, is one of the preparations for understanding their writings. With these views of the Bible, we feel it our bounden duty to exercise our reason upon it perpetually; to compare, to infer, to look beyond the letter to the spirit;

to seek in the nature of the subject, and the aim of the writer, his true meaning; and, in general, to make use of what is known, for explaining what is difficult, and for discovering new truths."

But do not all classes of Christians, and Protestants in particular, make use of their reason in interpreting Scripture? How else can the latter reconcile with their creed the declaration of Christ, that "unless we eat his flesh and drink his blood we have no life in us?" How do all understand his saying, that he "came not to send peace but a sword;" that we must "hate father and mother," and "pluck out the right eye," &c. &c.? Hence, where there is a variety of possible interpretations, the Unitarian exercises no greater freedom of selection than any other Christian; he selects that which he conceives accords best with the nature of the case, with the connexion of the passage, with the general strain of Scripture, and with the known and obvious laws of God and Nature. "In other words," proceeds Channing, "we believe that God never contradicts in one part of Scripture, what he teaches in another; and never contradicts, in revelation, what He teaches in his works and Providence. And we, therefore, distrust every interpretation which, after deliberate attention, seems repugnant to any established truth. We reason about the Bible precisely as civilians do about the Constitution under which we live; who are accustomed to limit one provision of that venerable instrument by others, and to fix the precise import of its parts by inquiring into its general spirit, into the intentions of its authors, and into the prevalent feelings, impressions, and circumstances of the time when it was framed. Without these principles of interpretation, we frankly acknowledge that we cannot defend the divine authority of the Scriptures. Deny us this latitude, and we must abandon this book to its enemies."

Religion, being paramount to all other things, surely

requires the most diligent exercise of our highest faculties in its concerns. We might, with comparative innocence, abandon our understanding in the pursuits of philosophy or science, receiving their propositions with a blind and credulous assent. But *wilfully* to suppress the exercise of our reason on the infinitely important subject which is so closely allied to our temporal and eternal happiness, would be more than inexcusable. But even they, we repeat, who blame Unitarians for a too free use of the principles of criticism above explained, in determining the sense of Scripture, do themselves use them in their controversies with infidels; and most frequently, too, in the construction and support of their own system of opinions. Indeed, none reason more than these sects of Christians. Thus, the doctrine of the Trinity is a doctrine of inference, which could not stand a moment without the aid of reason — a doctrine, indeed, of reason and reasoning, and not of Scripture. Upon how slight a foundation has been framed the prevailing theory of original sin; and the same may be said of the other distinguishing dogmas of Calvinism, doctrines which are incapable of support but by the most subtile and refined arguments.

"We, indeed, grant," says Channing, "that the use of reason in religion is accompanied with danger. But we ask any honest man to look back on the history of the Church, and say whether the renunciation of it be not still more dangerous. The worst errors have sprung up in that Church which proscribes reason, and demands from its members implicit faith. Besides, it is a plain fact, that men reason as erroneously on all subjects as on religion. Who does not know the wild and groundless theories which have been framed in physical and political science? But who ever supposed that we must cease to exercise reason in nature and society, because men have erred for ages in explaining them? Say what we may, God has given us a rational nature, and will call us to account for it.

We may let it sleep, but we do so at our peril. Revelation is addressed to us as rational beings. We may wish in our sloth, that God had given us a system, demanding no labor of comparing, limiting, and inferring. But such a system would be at variance with the whole character of our present existence; and it is the part of wisdom to take revelation as it is given to us, and to interpret it by the help of the faculties which it everywhere supposes, and on which it is founded."

What, then, are the great truths which, according to the principles of scriptural interpretation above expounded, the Unitarians believe the *New Testament* to contain, and Jesus to have taught as he was taught of God?

1st.—They believe in one God, and one only; that is, that he is one spirit, one being, one essence, and in no respect is he two, or three, or four; that he is underived or self-existent; that he always did and always will exist; and that he is ever the same, the infinite, eternal, immutable One, who created, and sustains, and blesses the universe. They consequently reject the doctrine of the Trinity, both on account of its inherent incredibility, and because it has no foundation in Scripture. They regard it as having originated in heathenism, in the dreams of Plato and his disciples, and taken up and improved upon by the Christian fathers, who were converts from Paganism. It was not, however, till the Council of Nice, in 325, that it received a definite, tangible shape. Mr. Wilson, in his admirable work on "Scripture Proofs and Scriptural Illustrations of Unitarianism" (which the reader will do well to consult), has adduced not fewer than fourteen or fifteen texts from the *New Testament* only, in which the Almighty Author of Universal Nature is *expressly* styled One: whereas it is impossible, with the utmost ingenuity, he proceeds to say, "To extract from the Sacred Scriptures, even a solitary text in which the Deity is explicitly called *Three*. He is, indeed, pro-

nounced to be Three by the decisions of councils and synods, by the dogmas of creeds and confessions, and by the dicta of learned but fallible men; but, on the other hand, he is declared to be One by much higher authority — by Moses and Christ, by Paul and other inspired individuals, as well as by the Jews who lived in our Saviour's time, and whose God and Father was the very Being whom Jesus himself recognised as his own God and Father. Moreover, Unitarians believe this one God, whose unity they thus deduce from the combined testimony of reason and of Scripture, *to be the only object of their worship.* They are of opinion that to worship *any* other being is a violation of the second command. Jesus worshipped God only; and he solemnly enjoins *us* to worship the Father. The Unitarians have full faith in what are called the *moral attributes* of God. Believing Him to be infinite in power and wisdom, omnipotent, omniscient, and eternal, they also conceive Him as a being of perfect benevolence, holiness, justice, and truth, of mercy and compassion; and that the happiness of his creatures, now and hereafter, is the great and only aim of his providential plan. They accordingly reject the five doctrines of Calvinism, because they invade and destroy these delightful attributes of the Deity, and are founded, it is believed, on a most mistaken system of Scriptural interpretation, and on an entire misapprehension of the language of the Bible."

Such, then, in a very few words, is the great leading article of Unitarian belief. And now it may be asked, what we have to say in regard to Jesus Christ? next, therefore, and —

2dly.—*As to the person of Christ.*—All Unitarians unite in denying that he is the Supreme God. All adopt the language of the New Testament, and say that he is the Messiah, or Anointed—the Son of God; our Mediator, and Saviour; since all these names are understood as compatible with his inferiority to the

Father, nay, as teaching it. All Unitarians deny the *Deity*, though not the *Divinity* of Christ; some, as Milton for instance, suppose that he pre-existed in great power and glory, was either Creator of this and other worlds, or some great Spirit, and, in the fulfilment of the purposes of Heaven, at the appointed time, veiled his high nature in the humble form of a man, was born of the Virgin, and became our Saviour and teacher. Milton thus represents the Father addressing the Son:—

> "Thou, therefore, whom thou only canst redeem,
> Their nature also to thy nature join;
> And be thyself Man among men on earth,
> Made flesh, when time shall be, of virgin seed,
> By wond'rous birth: Be thou in Adam's room
> The head of all mankind, though Adam's son."
> *Paradise Lost.* Book III.

And again, in another part of the same book:

> "Thee next they sang *of all creation first*,
> Begotten Son, Divine Similitude,
> In whose conspicuous countenance, without cloud
> Made visible, the Almighty Father shines,
> Whom else no creature can behold: on thee
> Impress'd the effulgence of his glory abides,
> Transfused on thee his ample spirit rests."

But against this view of our Lord's nature and person others seriously object, and hold that the New Testament teaches that Jusus Christ was a man *divinely inspired*, to make known the will of God as it was imparted to him, and to be the founder, the first herald and preacher, of a new religion. They believe that he came in the name, and was endowed with the wisdom and power of the Father; that he spoke as he was moved by the Father; that the works or miracles he performed were by the power of the Father, manifested through him; in short, that in all that Jesus did, said, and taught, he was an instrument in the hand of God; and that all the doctrines, precepts, instructions of his ministry, were the suggestions of the Spirit of God dwelling within him. Hence, his *religion is divine*, and *from* God, though his *person* be not.

The difference between Trinitarianism and Unitarianism in this particular may be thought, on the first view of the matter, to be of slight moment to the interests of mankind. But Unitarians do not think so; and their belief in the inferiority of the Son to the Father, and in the *Divinity of the Saviour's Mission and Authority*, unites them in strenuous and persevering efforts to establish the grand truth of the unity of God, from the deep conviction they entertain of the immense importance of that truth to the interests of virtue (which Dr. Channing has indeed so ably illustrated and explained in many parts of his writings), as well as to the reception of Christianity itself by enlightened and reflecting men.

We come, next, to the office and character of Jesus, a subject which our space compels us to dismiss in a very few words. All Unitarians regard him as the mediator between God and man — that is, the medium through which mercy and pardon and peace were conveyed to our sinning race.

All acknowledge and receive him as the Messiah, the Son of God, the Anointed Prophet long-expected by Israel. They accept him as their instructor and guide in religious truth; as their Saviour from sin and folly in this state of existence, and their punishment in a future life.

Unitarians estimate the character of the Saviour at its highest value. They regard it as one of perfect moral purity and holiness. He was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." His spotless example they are anxious to hold up as a faultless model for the imitation of the Christian. The great use to be made of this perfect pattern set before us, is to emulate his virtues, strive to conform ourselves to his likeness, and to suffer the dispositions and affections that were manifested in him, to become rooted and grounded in our hearts.

3dly.—In no respect, perhaps, do Unitarians differ

more from what are called orthodox believers, than in their opinions with regard to the nature and condition of man. They believe the Bible teaches that man comes into being with a nature neither holy nor unholy, but with the power of becoming either the one or the other; that he is not the object of the divine disapprobation and anger; for God hates only sin, and the infant has not sinned: nor of his moral approbation, for the infant has not yet formed a moral character; but we may safely say he is the object of the complacent regards, of the merciful love of God; "for *He* made man, and made him dependent, brings him into life helpless and weak, physically and morally; yet destines him to happiness, as the end of his being; and he must therefore love him, and feel an interest in his welfare, moral and spiritual, of which no earthly parent, reasoning from the affection which he bears towards his offspring, can form the slightest conception." It will hence be perceived that the doctrine of the Unitarians in regard to this matter, is completely opposed to that of Calvin, which teaches the total depravity of man;—they cannot believe, arguing from the Scriptures as well as the known attributes of the Deity, that man comes into existence under the wrath and curse of God, the heir of hell, by virtue of his descent from Adam. They conceive this idea to be too monstrous, not to say impious, to be entertained for a moment. They hold man's state and condition in the world to be probationary—a state intended to discipline him, by its difficulties and temptations, to the love and practice of virtue, and thus to fit him for Heaven; — that he possesses a moral capacity to make himself what he pleases; — that he is under the power of no necessity, of no eternal decrees which would take away the obligations of active personal virtue; under no irresistible, sudden, supernatural influences, which remove the necessity and the motives for holiness; in short, that he is subjected to no natural and inherited inability, making him incapable of

righteous acts and holy thoughts, such as God will vouchsafe to accept and reward.

Closely connected with this point, is that of man's acceptance with God. The complicated system of depravity, predestination, effectual calling, and the like, is considered by Unitarians as not only inconsistent with the simplicity of God's ways, but as contradictory and revolting to every idea formed of his works, his wisdom, his equity, and his goodness. They believe that the Scriptures teach a very different doctrine, with respect to man's salvation; one that better harmonizes with the character and attributes and dealings of God, as well as with the nature of man—one that gives every possible encouragement to moral virtue. They believe, then, that *faith toward God and repentance through our Lord Jesus Christ*, their sincerity being tested by a life of holiness, piety, purity, and benevolence, *are the conditions of salvation, according to the New Testament.* And now, it may be asked, is man then capable of perfect holiness, and can he *claim* eternal life on the ground of his own righteousness? To this we reply in the words of an able expositor of Unitarian belief: "God forbid; God's *free, unpurchased, infinite mercy*, is the ground of our assurance and our hope. And we think it a ground large enough for the whole universe to stand upon. We believe, through the Scriptures, that as God requires forgiveness in man towards man, as the first and last of his virtues, so he possesses the attribute himself in all its loveliness and perfection; and, as our Lord has represented in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, stands ever ready with the outstretched arms of parental love, to receive and forgive the returning—the reformed sinner. This we believe to be the simple and sublime teaching of revelation; and that God does not demand that his forgiveness shall be bought, *forced from him by the voluntary sacrifice and death in man's stead of the infinite God, his equal and son!*"

Accordingly, Unitarians reject the commonly received doctrine of the Atonement. We need not stop to describe that doctrine; suffice it to say, that they consider it as most unscriptural, and most subversive of God's moral character, and the interests of vital religion. This doctrine, which the generality of Christians hold, if it seems to provide an easy method of salvation, does so at the expense of God's justice and mercy; if it represents the Son of God as full of benevolence, it represents the Father as unforgiving, unjust, and unmerciful; it drives us from the mercy-seat of the Father Almighty to the compassion of the self-immolating Son; and when we come to that petition which our Lord has told us to offer up,—"Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us"—it seals our lips, teaching us that God himself does not and cannot forgive.

If it be asked, what efficacy, then, do Unitarians ascribe to the *death* of Christ?—they answer, a moral one; to it they attribute the *same kind* of power which they do to his life, example, precepts, and sufferings. His death was necessary that he might establish and put beyond doubt or cavil that most efficacious, and most important, to the Christian, of all truths, the resurrection from the dead, and the retributory state. By the manner of his death, he set the seal of truth to his character and revelation; by his death he has opened the way to everlasting life, has established the truth of man's resurrection, and the connected one of his immortality and the future state; by his death he has taken away the victory from the grave, has divested it of all the terrors and doubts that had always hung over it, and ever would have shrouded it but for the example of his victory. Thus did his death answer ends unspeakably important. Jesus died that we might live forever.

Scarcely need it be remarked after this, that Unitarians believe in the resurrection of the dead and the

life everlasting. Death they look upon, not so much as even a temporary or momentary extinction of being, but simply as the appointed manner in which the soul passes from one stage of existence to another—from earth to Heaven. Hence, to the virtuous man, death is the gate of life.

But what is your doctrine of rewards and punishments? some one may say. And to this question we reply as briefly as possible in the words of the writer before quoted:—

"We believe this doctrine to be surpassed in importance by no other in the Bible. For, however a few speculative and thinking men might pursue virtue and love it, obey God and love him, without the restraining influences of the doctrine of the future punishment of sin, the great mass of mankind could not and would not. And while we do not believe the *eternity* of all future punishment of sin, to be the doctrine either of Scripture or reason, and regard it as a tenet that has in many respects an unhappy influence on human conduct and character, we reject with still stronger disbelief, the doctrine of Universal Salvation, considering it as fraught with the most pernicious consequences—more pernicious to the interests of Christian virtue, or of Christ's religion on earth, than any other opinion ever preached. We have been, and are by many, confounded with Universalists on this point. But we do not receive their distinguishing doctrine; Unitarians look upon it with dread, and with strong convictions of its immoral influences.

"Rejecting the two extremes—the eternity of future punishment, and the salvation of *all* men, without exception or difference—we adopt what we conceive to be the true doctrine of Scripture on this point; what seems to be implied in all our Saviour's preachings, and in all the writings of his Apostles, viz.: the reward and punishment of mankind according to the deeds done in the body; the righteous adjustment of

future sufferings, to the sins of each individual. But, though we cannot refuse our most firm belief in this necessary truth of the future suffering of the wicked, yet we think that it is not inflicted to gratify vengeance, or to satisfy an offended law, but for the same purpose, with the same view, that sufferings are permitted here—in order to the reformation, discipline, and improvement of the sufferer. We believe that the suffering of *futurity* is made subservient to the same good and sublime end, as pain and suffering *on earth*, namely, man's moral perfection, and hence, eventually, his highest happiness; that it will, therefore, be disciplinary, remedial, purifying, saving in its character, and will, consequently, at one time cease—at *that time* whenever it shall be, that the offender shall be reformed by it, and restored to the love and practice of virtue, to the love of God and to a perception of the real greatness of his nature, and the true ends of his being. Most Unitarians, however, are satisfied to use the Scripture expressions on this subject, without pretending to say what Scripture has nowhere said, when those sufferings shall end. Scripture phraseology gives us to understand that those sufferings shall be *great*, *dreadful*, and *enduring*. We believe it, and tremble in the belief, and repeat without commentary, the words of Christ and his Apostles: 'Verily I say unto you, these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.' 'God will render to every man, according to his deeds; to them that obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil.'"

We have thus endeavored to give, in a very brief space, for the benefit of the uninitiated, a reply to the often-repeated interrogatory—*What is Unitarianism?* We have confined ourselves, it is true, to the leading points of theological belief, and we have done so because they constitute the source from which flow those views of man, his nature and destiny, of man regarded

as an individual or in society, which may be said to distinguish, in general, the Unitarian from almost every other class of Christians. These views have, of late years, been largely developed in the writings of Unitarian divines, particularly of America; and it is to the works of these authors, more especially, not forgetting at the same time those of many excellent English writers, that we must refer the reader for full and satisfactory information on these important topics.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.*

ANDREWS NORTON possesses the well-earned reputation of being a learned and acute Biblical scholar. His mental qualifications are of a high order, and his writings are distinguished by great clearness and power. To the cause of Unitarianism he has on various occasions rendered good service; and his work on *The Genuineness of the Gospels* is a valuable contribution to the cause of general Christianity. In the second volume of that work there is a note—more than a hundred and fifty pages long—*on the Jewish Dispensation, the Pentateuch, and the other Books of the Old Testament.* In this note Mr. Norton declares his belief in the divine origin of the Jewish religion, but denies the authenticity of the writings commonly attributed to Moses. He contends "that the revelation of God through Moses was made at so remote a period, that no contemporary or early history of it remains; though imperishable monuments of it exist in the effects which

* The Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels. By Andrews Norton. 3 vols. 8vo. 1837 and 1844.
Critical History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon. By M. Stuart, Professor of Sac. Literature in the Theol. Seminary, Andover, Mass. 12mo. pp. 452. 1845.

it produced." (P. cxlviii.) The ritual law did not, in his judgment, form any part of that revelation, but was a corruption adopted at a comparatively late period of Jewish history. In the views of religion presented by the Psalms and the writings of the Prophets, he thinks he finds the greatest resemblance to the true character of the divine system originally made known; and those views he regards as offering a *contrast* to the system developed in the Pentateuch. The Pentateuch was, in his opinion, compiled after the books just mentioned were written; and he states that "perhaps we cannot with probability assign to it, in its present form, an earlier date than some time after the return of the Jews from their captivity." (P. xcvi.) To the other books of which the Old Testament is composed, he attributes very various merit; and considers them, as a whole, "to be works of the greatest curiosity and interest, coming down to us from a remote antiquity; marking the history of our race with a long track of light, though broken and clouded, when all would be darkness without them; bearing in their habitual reference to God, which gives them so peculiar a character, the impress of the divine dispensation in which they had their origin; and uttering, with the voice of far distant ages, sentiments of piety to which the heart of man still responds." (P. clxxxi.) It ought to be stated, in justice to Mr. Norton, that his opinions on the subject of the Pentateuch are not only held in connection with the firmest belief in Christianity, but have been evidently adopted by him for the purpose of adding consistency and strength to that belief. His persuasion that Moses was an inspired messenger of God, is the result of his persuasion of the divine origin of Christianity; and he thinks that he removes a serious imputation from the gospel by showing that it is not responsible for the religious system which goes under the name of Moses. It was not, according to him, *that* system, therefore, to which our Saviour gave

his sanction, but *another*, of which that was but the corruption. To the original Jewish dispensation Jesus Christ appealed; but so far from assenting to, he opposed the popular notions of the Jews respecting the divine origin and authority of the Levitical law and the authorship of the Pentateuch. In this way Mr. Norton regards himself as vindicating the character of Christ; and full credit must be given to him, not only for purity of intention in the matter, but also for devout attachment to Christianity. His whole work is a monument to that attachment. It would, still farther, be unfair to Mr. Norton to suppose that he was influenced in his objections to Judaism, as represented in the Pentateuch, by the philosophy which repudiates miraculous interference. In this very note, he more than once indignantly protests against such philosophy. He not only considers Moses to have been supernaturally endowed, but he admits the claim of Jewish history to miracles wrought among the Israelites subsequently to the time of Moses. His concessions on this head are made in much too skeptical a spirit for our taste; but we have pleasure in pointing out the wide difference existing between his speculations and those which are based upon the principle of treating every alleged departure from natural law as necessarily fabulous.

It is not our intention to enter upon an examination of the objections urged by Mr. Norton against the character and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. They possess no novelty; and although some of them present considerable difficulties, we are surprised that others, the reply to which is so obvious and satisfactory, should have been insisted upon by him. We cannot resist the conclusion that his strong desire to make out a case, has injuriously interfered with the discrimination in the exercise of which his matter should have been chosen. His discussion is especially deficient, inasmuch as it does not afford an adequate representa-

tion of the views and arguments by which an opposite theory to his may be supported. There is not only much more to be said on the other side than he has taken notice of, but that which he has passed by is often more conclusive than that which he has attended to. There is another general objection which we have to his mode of treating his subject. He regards the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch as involving far greater responsibility than justly belongs to it. There is a marked difference between the allowances he makes as to the principles which should regulate our interpretation of the other books of the Old Testament, and the strictness he requires in the use of these books. Much that he says, in consistency with that strictness, can only press against those who hold the theory of the inspiration of the writings themselves. That theory we do not hold, and can therefore admit into our estimate of the case a degree of ignorance and mistake and imperfection, by which some of its most formidable difficulties may be reasonably explained. Believing though we do, that Moses was substantially the author of the Pentateuch, we do not believe what is there written to be free from great incorrectness. Believing though we do, that the religious system there described was the system revealed by God to the Israelites, we do not consider the form in which it is made known to us to be divine, but human.

As to Mr. Norton's grand position, that Judaism in its true and original form was something entirely different from the Judaism which the law of Moses, as we have received it, exhibits to us, — it is, in our judgment, altogether untenable. We cannot discover the slightest foundation for it, in fact. It seems to us a pure hypothesis, arising solely from the moral objections entertained by its author to the only kind of Judaism of which we have any account. The original revelation thus imagined to exist, is nowhere to be found. It is not even pretended to be pointed out.

We think it quite beneath the office of either a historical or theological critic to put forward so mere a supposition in order to serve the important purposes to which it is here applied. These purposes it cannot serve. No one who sympathizes with Mr. Norton in his moral objections to Judaism as we have it, can be expected to retain a faith in the divine origin of the Jewish religion, on the ground that that religion was an unknown something which might be worthy of the character of God. The theory would be entirely useless for the conviction of such an objector. He would say, and reasonably say, Let me at least understand *what it is* in favor of which you ask my belief, before I yield my assent to it — I cannot take merely upon credit the religious truth for whose sake your demand of faith is made from me.

The nearest approach to any thing like proof of the existence of a Mosaic system different from the ritual one, is contained in those passages quoted by Mr. Norton from the Prophets, in which moral goodness is set above ceremonial obedience. They are, however, very far from amounting to such proof. They detail no religious system different from that with which we are acquainted. They are, in our opinion, reconcilable with that system; but if they were not so — if, as Mr. Norton argues, they were designed to oppose such a system, — they most obviously *imply its existence.* Whatever their intention be, their very construction goes full to the point, that the Judaism of the period at which they were written bore the same general character as that described in the Levitical law.

Mr. Norton, as we have already said, bases his belief of the divine origin of the Jewish religion upon his faith in Christianity. In consistency with his theory, he supposes that what our Saviour sanctioned was not the written law as it existed in his time, but a revelation which was superseded by that law. The criticism by which this supposition is defended is the weakest part

of his production. To affirm, as he does, that Christ accommodated himself to the prejudices of the Jews, and that when he said, "Moses wrote concerning me," either he meant, "Moses *as you suppose* wrote concerning me," or the word *wrote* was inaccurately inserted by the evangelist instead of the word *taught*, will not at all meet the wants of the case. The references of Christ which bear upon the question related *solely* to the writings of the Old Testament. If he did not refer to them, he referred to nothing with which we are acquainted. There is no known system in favor of which the accommodation attributed to him could have been made. He never distinguished or hinted at a distinction between two different kinds of Judaism, one of which was contained in the Scriptures, and the other revealed elsewhere. He distinguished between the imperfection of Judaism and his own purer revelation; but whether we understand him, as Mr. Norton does, to have cast absolute discredit upon Judaism, or, as he is generally understood, to have simply proposed the better truth to which Judaism was preparatory, there is not a shadow of evidence that he kept in his view a Jewish religion involving no necessity for such distinction. If the latter were the case, so far from thinking, with Mr. Norton, that our Saviour would have been restrained by any prudential considerations from contrasting the corrupted Judaism exhibited in the Scriptures, with the true Judaism which accorded with his own doctrines, we are persuaded that the presentation of such a contrast would have been much less offensive to his countrymen than the plan he actually adopted. They would have been more likely to yield to the authority of their law in its original form, than to the personal authority which he asserted for himself. He did contrast their vain traditions with the written commands of God; and the only reason to be given why he did not contrast writings which he believed to be false, with divine communications into

whose place those writings had stepped, is, that he had no knowledge of such communications. They enter not into his statements or allusions ; and till they can be pointed out as plainly recognized by him, we must consider them as a pure invention. The argument from the divinity of Christianity to the divinity of Judaism, can never be rationally brought to bear upon a Mosaic religion of which Christianity makes no mention.

The work of MOSES STUART on *The Critical History and Defence of the Old-Testament Canon*, is intended to be a reply to Mr. Norton's speculations. Every thing proceeding from Mr. Stuart must possess considerable value ; but of this treatise, taken as a whole, we are not able to speak in terms of high commendation. It is a slovenly production, and presents a marked contrast, in style of composition and order of arrangement, to the lucid dissertation against which it is directed. It cannot with any propriety be considered as an answer to what Mr. Norton has advanced. It is mainly employed in shewing, that at the time of our Saviour, and for a long period previously, the books which compose our canon of the Old Testament were regarded by the Jews as genuine and sacred. This we suppose Mr. Norton would not deny. The conclusion drawn by Mr. Stuart from the undisputed fact just mentioned is, that the sanction given to the Jewish Scriptures by Jesus Christ necessitates us, as Christians, to accept the Old Testament in the same character as the Jews attributed to it. We do not agree with him to the full extent of this conclusion ; but we do think that the process of reasoning by which it is surported bears very forcibly against Mr. Norton's therory. Other arguments calculated to shake that theory are also introduced in the course of the discussion ; and much of the information given is indirectly applicable to points important to the controversy which ought to have been more fully set forth. Though Mr. Stuart

has not fairly met the objections of his opponent, and though he has frequently failed to do justice to his own views, we are persuaded that he has presented a case with the substantial truth of which Mr. Norton's notions cannot be reconciled.

The cardinal fault of Mr. Stuart's discussion is his continually insisting upon the *inspiration* of the books of the Old Testament. The doctrine of inspiration is not only a conclusion to which he invariably endeavors to bring his reader, but he puts it forth as the great means of overbearing the difficulties presented to him in the course of his investigation. He thus cuts the knots which he fails to untie. Resting the reception of the Jewish Scriptures, as he does, upon the character assigned to them by the Christian revelation, the grand point he had to establish on this question of inspiration is, that Christianity lays down the doctrine for which he contends. Unless he proves that, he proves nothing. *That* he does not prove. There is but one passage of the New Testament which can with any fairness be alleged as containing such proof. We refer, of course, to 2 Tim. iii. 16, rendered in our Common Version—"All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine," &c. The translation we prefer deprives this passage of its application to the point in hand. We render it, "All scripture given by inspiration of God is also profitable for doctrine," &c. Of this rendering Mr. Stuart takes no notice. He does, however, make a concession which ought to have led him to the adoption of our view of the case. He thus expounds the passage: "Every scripture, πᾶσα γραφή, i. e. every constituent part or portion of the Scriptures, as the omission of the *article* of course implies (not πᾶσα ἡ γραφή, all the scripture, spoken of as merely a collective unity), is inspired of God." Now if πᾶσα γραφή does not mean *all the scripture*, but *every scripture*, we submit that those words must be immediately connected with

θεόπνευστος to indicate what kind of scripture or writing it is to which the apostle refers, i. e. *inspired* writing. The phrase πᾶσα γραφὴ cannot apply to the Old-Testament Scriptures *as such*, except in their form of "a collective unity." "Every constituent part or portion of the Scriptures," is most certainly an interpretation which this phrase will not bear. We repeat, then, that there is no evidence of the doctrine of inspiration, in its application to the whole collection of books comprised in the Old Testament, being enforced upon us by Christianity. Without such evidence, that doctrine falls to the ground. But that is not all, as far as Mr. Stuart is concerned. He admits of interpolations, errors and discrepancies, as existing to a great extent in the Jewish Scriptures. How these are to be reconciled with the inspiration of those books, he does not tell us. We believe that no such reconciliation can be effected. Either the argument for inspiration covers the whole collection of books as a whole, or it must be brought separately to bear upon all its different parts. Mr Stuart does not attempt to bring it to bear upon the separate parts of the collection. It is sufficiently clear, from what he has said, that such an attempt would in his hands be a miserable failure. On the other hand, no argument for the inspiration of the canon as a whole can succeed, when it is allowed that there are various portions of that canon whose historical truth is more than doubtful, and which are inconsistent with each other. Mr. Stuart's theory of inspiration is opposed to his own facts. There is another remark which we have to make before we dismiss this question. of inspiration. Mr. Stuart never informs us what he means by inspiration. He intimates, in one place, that he is no believer in "plenary *verbal* inspiration;" and, in another place, he rejects the Jewish notion, as delivered by Philo that the person inspired was entirely passive under the divine influence exerted upon him. We think him inconsistent in both these respects. The in-

spiration which attaches to a collection of books must be *verbal* inspiration; we can conceive of no other that answers to the case. If, moreover, an argument drawn from the mode in which the Jews regarded their Scriptures be fairly applicable to the regulation of our faith in the same Scriptures, it must go to the point, that the faith they held is the faith we ought to hold. We are bound on that ground to accept, not any kind of inspiration we please, but that particular kind which they accepted. These inconsistencies we, however, pass by with a bare allusion to them. What we wish especially to observe here is, that Mr. Stuart has carefully abstained from defining the inspiration upon which he himself so imperatively insists. He tells us what he does *not* believe upon the point, but he neglects to tell us what he *does* believe. He thus leaves the whole subject in doubt and confusion. We are persuaded that whatever theory he chose to adopt, might be shewn not to square with much contained in his book; but as the matter at present stands, the most important principle to the enforcement of which that book is directed, is left unexplained.

One striking characteristic of Mr. Stuart's work is the irritation it displays towards the class of theologians to which Mr. Norton belongs. Of "*the more liberal* among the class of liberals" who reject all that is supernatural in Christianity, he can speak not only with calmness, but in terms of respect. It is in a very different spirit, however, that he treats those whose liberal views of religion are united with a strong attachment to the gospel in its form of a miraculous revelation. He can scarcely refer to them without losing his temper. He plainly intimates that he would much prefer their being unbelievers, to their retaining their present position within the Christian pale. His own dogmatic theology is so much more valuable to him than faith in the divinity of the system from which he derives that theology, that he would be willing to see that faith sacrificed to

the interest of his particular views. This state of mind has led him far astray both from truth and charity. It has caused him so to shape his argument, as, if possible, to force upon those who differ from him an entire renunciation of Christianity. He has done considerable injury to his cause by this means. His defences of some things contained in the Old Testament are so far strained in favor of popular prejudice, as frequently to fix upon him the character of a one-sided advocate. He suffers truthful investigation often to give place to mere special-pleading. In this way he may increase his reputation among the orthodox masses, but he will repel those honest thinkers whom it ought to be his chief purpose to convince. We are not, however, inclined to attribute the irritation of which we have spoken, solely to Mr. Stuart's zeal for orthodoxy. It arises quite as much from the evident sympathy he himself has with more liberal principles of scriptural interpretation than those by which orthodoxy is commonly supported. He is, in this respect, much superior to the class to which he belongs; and his secret consciousness of a nearer approach to the views of his opponents, than is distinctive of those with whom he acts, originates a more bitter feeling towards his heterodox brethren than would otherwise exist. This is not seldom the case with others as well as with him.

Though reluctantly compelled to make these somewhat severe reflections upon his conduct, we have yet great pleasure in calling special attention to the liberality to which we have just alluded. It constitutes the great value of his book. The advice he gives as to the manner in which the Old Testament should be used by Christians will be eminently beneficial to the party among whom his influence extends. A few sentences extracted from that advice will place his labors in a more favorable light than could be done by any thing we might say.

"Many good men, in treating of Old-Testament matters, and

explaining the contents of these books, seem to think that they are at liberty to pursue allegory and type, and analogical processes, to any extent that they please. A greater mistake can hardly be made in so important a concern. The moment a reader or hearer gets possession of the idea that a writer or preacher is merely addressing himself to his imagination and fancy, he ceases to give him his serious confidence. He may be amused—greatly amused, if we must concede it—by the ingenuity and vivid fancy of his interpreter; but, after all, he will with difficulty be brought to believe that the sacred writers addressed themselves to readers in the way of amusement. His first feeling, after a little wonder, or perhaps of admiration, is over, is indifference. His next is uneasiness in reading or hearing things of this nature. It is well if the matter does not end in contempt of the whole. I would that the Old Testament were employed oftentimes in quite a different way from that which is not uncommon in resorting to it. What can any one say of those teachers who find just as full and complete a revelation in the Old Testament of every Christian doctrine, as in the New? For example, the doctrine of the *Trinity* is found as completely there, as in the New Testament. Yet the Saviour, in reference even to Moses, says, that 'no man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, *he hath declared him.*' (John i. 18.) Were the Jews *Trinitarians* before the coming of Christ? I know of no satisfactory evidence of this fact. All the efforts to prove it have ended in mere appeals to *cabbalizing* Jews, who lived long after the New Testament was written. It is the light which the New Testament casts upon various passages of the Old, and that only, which enables us to bring the Old Testament to bear upon this doctrine."—P. 406.

"Violence done to the understanding and to sober common sense, although it may be slow-footed, will be certain to avenge itself at last. If there is any book in all the world addressed to the sober reason and judgment of men, that book is the Bible. It is written by men, addressed to men, and designed for men. Of course it adopts a human and intelligible manner of address throughout. God has shown his paternal condescension to the weakness of men in all this. The Scriptures written in any other manner could be of little profit to us. And when we seek methods of interpretation applied to them which no other book will bear, and which would hold any one up to scorn, if he should adopt them in explaining a classic, how can it be expected that the understanding and reason will not distrust them, and sooner or later be sure to revolt against them? Among all the abuses of the Old Testament, none are more conspicuous than those which result from *sectarian* views and purposes.

What a mere lump of wax does the Bible become in the hands of a zealous defender of sect, perfectly mouldable at his pleasure! No laws of language or of grammar stand in his way. The original intention of the writer of Scripture is little or nothing to the purpose. The *occult* meaning is summoned to his aid; and this is always ready, at his bidding, to assume every possible form. Armed in this way, his antagonists are cut down by whole ranks at a blow, and the *standard* of sect waves speedily over that of the Bible."—P. 410.

These sentiments are very honorable to their author, and they stand amongst many others, as true and important as themselves.

A FEW WORDS ABOUT WAR.

BY JAMES HENRY, M.D., DUBLIN.

Two islands lying near each other in the Atlantic Ocean, were at a remote period of time inhabited by a people who professed and believed the Christian religion. This people were taught and commanded by their pure and holy Faith, to love their enemies, to forgive injuries, and to recompense good for evil, to live peaceably with all men; and to take it for their rule of conduct always to do unto others as they would that others should do unto them. Such was the ordinance and command of their Lord Christ Jesus, delivered to his disciples in the most earnest, affectionate, and authoritative manner; and with the awful warning, that if they did not forgive those who trespassed against them, neither would their Heavenly Father forgive them their own trespasses.

Now the people of these two islands observed this command of their Divine Master in the following manner.

They kept an armed force by sea and land, consist-

ing of nearly two hundred thousand fighting men, whom they sent to the north, and to the south, and to the east, and to the west, to kill, and to burn, and to destroy. And some of these men were on foot, and shot and stabbed with guns and bayonets; and others of them were on horseback, and had lances in their rests, and swords by their sides, and pistols at their saddle-bows; and if any person escaped and fled from the foot soldiers, the horsemen galloped after them, and trampled them under their horses' hoofs, and cut them to pieces with their swords, and shot them with their pistols. And those who sent out these armed men were called Christians, disciples of the meek and merciful Jesus; and the armed men themselves were called Christians; and many of those whom they killed and destroyed were their brethren in Christ.

And the people of those islands had great guns which they called cannon, and they armed large ships with them, and sent them to America, and to Egypt, and to Syria, and to India, and to Arabia, and to China, and to Turkey, and to France, and to Spain, and to Portugal; and they anchored them off the maritime towns of those countries, and discharged the cannon against the walls and the houses, until they battered them down. And some of the balls from the cannon were red hot, and set fire to the houses into which they fell; and others of the balls were hollow, and filled inside with smaller balls, and gunpowder, and iron spikes, and these exploded where they fell, and killed and destroyed all around.

And by these means great multitudes of men, women, and children were killed; and many were wounded and maimed for life; and many died miserably of their wounds, after long continued suffering; and many men were taken prisoners, and carried into captivity far from their native land; and many women were made widows, and children orphans; and numbers who escaped with their lives and liberty, lost all their pro-

perty, and were driven to wander about the world, not knowing where to lay their heads, and mourning for their slaughtered friends and relatives.

And when the news of these exploits arrived in those islands, there were great rejoicings among all the people, and they forgot the sufferings, and wounds, and deaths of their own soldiers, or considered them as of no account, so great was their joy for the injury which they had inflicted upon others. And in their joy they illuminated their houses, and had grand reviews and mock fights. And those persons whose occupations kept them at home, and prevented them from going with the armies, and taking part in, or witnessing the actual slaughter, delighted to see these reviews and mock fights; and men, women, and children went to see them, and took pleasure in hearing the firing of the musketry and of the cannon, and in seeing the flashing of the swords, and the charging of the cavalry, and some flying, and some pursuing, and others lying for dead, as if it were a real battle.

And it was the duty of the chief governor of those islands to take care that all the soldiers and their captains were always ready prepared to shed blood, and to burn and destroy at a moment's notice: and that their powder was always dry, and their arms shining and bright, and all their equipments perfect. And all the soldiers and their captains were rewarded according to the number of men, women, and children, whom they had killed, and of the towns which they had battered down and burnt, and the extent of country which they had pillaged. And one portion of the property which they had carried off was divided among them, and called prize-money; and the other portion was put into the public treasury.

And the captains who had killed and destroyed most received the greatest honor, and all the people flocked to see them; and estates, and titles, and decorations were heaped upon them; and pillars and testimonials

were erected to them in the most public places; and monuments and trophies in the houses where the people of those islands used to meet, for the purpose of praying to the meek and lowly Jesus, whose command was "Love your enemies."

And when the captains and the soldiers returned home, they went with all the people into these houses of prayer, and sang "Not unto us, O Lord, but unto thee be the glory of all that we have slain, and destroyed;" and then they fell down on their knees, with their swords by their sides, and the banners which they had taken from the enemy waving over their heads, and prayed, saying, "Thou Lord of peace and love, who forbiddest the shedding of blood, be merciful unto us, even as we are merciful unto others." And when they had done singing and praying, they came out, and made ready to fight, and to burn, and to kill, and to destroy, as before.

And the people of those islands were generally successful in their warlike enterprises, and defeated their enemies with great slaughter; but sometimes they met a reverse, and were themselves defeated, and their soldiers and captains slain or taken prisoners by the enemy. And then, when the news of the disaster reached home, all the people were filled with indignation, and some of them cried out, "Let us send more soldiers, and take vengeance upon the enemy." And some cried, "Let us send more soldiers, and redeem our honor and dignity;" and others cried, "Let us send more soldiers, or what will become of our trade and commerce?" And they did so, and fought, and killed and burned, and destroyed again, and took vengeance upon the enemy; and redeemed their honor and dignity, and extended their trade and commerce.

And the captains of the soldiers were so honored by all the people of those islands, that more persons desired to be captains than could be appointed; and there arose a rivalry among them, and they contended who

should be appointed captain. So a rule was made, that the appointment to be a captain should be sold at a high price; and then the richest men began to buy the appointment for their sons, and bestow it on them as a means by which they might maintain themselves and their families in wealth and honor. And to prepare them for this appointment, they sent them to colleges and schools, where the art of fighting and killing, and of sinking ships, and of storming and burning towns was taught as a science. And when the young men had become proficients in the art, and their fathers had paid the stipulated price, they were appointed captains, and ever afterwards lived by fighting and killing, respected and honored by every one.

And sometimes it happened that the same father would rear up one of his sons to be a captain, and to live by shedding blood, and another of his sons to be a minister of the Gospel of Christ, and to preach peace and good will to all men. And sometimes you might see the two brothers walking in the streets together, arm in arm, or going in the same carriage to the courts and levees of the chief governor of those islands; the one dressed plainly as became a minister of the Gospel, and the other in a splendid suit of scarlet or purple cloth, embroidered with gold, and a sword by his side, and martial plumes upon his head. And sometimes it happened, that if their father was a man of sufficient rank and consequence, the chief governor appointed one of his brothers to be his *aid-de-camp* and attendant in all his affairs of war and injury to his neighbor, and the other to be his chaplain and attendant in all his spiritual affairs, and to preach and explain to him the Gospel of Christ.

But the private soldiers were compelled to obey their captains in all things, and to undergo fatigue and hardships of every kind, and were never promoted beyond the ranks, or made captains; no matter how many men they had killed and destroyed, or how well

and bravely they had obeyed orders. So very few desired to be private soldiers. And when the people of those islands found that very few, even of the poorest sort, desired to be private soldiers, they tempted them with large bribes; and when they were not able even by large bribes to prevail upon as many as they wished to become private soldiers, they kidnapped them, and carried them away by force from their houses and families, and put them on board their ships, and compelled them to work them, and to fire the guns, and to kill, burn, and destroy at the command of the captains. And if any of them murmured, they flogged them with whipcord upon the bare back, until they stripped the flesh off their bones, so that many of them fainted away with agony, and some of them died. And if any of them attempted to return home to their country and families, they followed and seized them, and making them kneel down upon their coffins, shot them dead; and when they had done so, they prayed to the Lord Jesus to forgive them their trespasses, as they forgave those that trespassed against them.

And it required great sums of money to pay the salaries of the captains and the wages of the soldiers, and to purchase equipments and arms and ammunition, and to build ships of war; so they levied taxes for the purpose; and when all the taxes were not sufficient to meet the expense, they borrowed sums of money so vast that they could never be repaid, and the interest of which remained a burthen upon their own industry, and that of their children, and their children's children for ever. So the people of those islands, by means of their ships of war and their captains and their soldiers, extended their dominion and power to every part of the world, and their name became a terror to all nations, and their rich men became the richest on the face of the earth.

And the people of those islands sent out missionaries to convert the Heathen, and to teach them the

pure and holy religion of the Lord Jesus; but the Heathen said, "Who are ye that come to teach us, and that practise not yourselves what ye teach? Behold ye make war, and ye lust for conquest and power and dominion, and your name is a proverb and a byword among all nations for love of gold, so that even the Heathen mock you." And they closed their ears, and turned away, and said one to another, "If the God which these men preach to us were a true God, they would keep his commandments."

Thus did the people of those islands crucify their Lord afresh, and put a snare and a stumbling block in the way of the Heathen.

THE PRIMROSE.

THANK GOD! though we be prone to grieve,
  Small things can bring us joy;
And holy feelings planted deep,
Though change or care may bid them sleep,
  No time can e'er destroy.

Dear friend! thy thought was but to give
  This pale and scented flower,
Some token of the spring to show;
Thou gavest me more than thou canst know—
  A charm of wondrous power!

My lips are trembling now with prayer,
  My eyes are full of tears:
The blessed thoughts that once were mine
Come back with this small gift of thine,
  Pure as in childhood's years.

Again I wander as of old,
  Or watch the calm spring sky,
Though roofing boughs look down on me,
Kneeling beneath some tented tree,
  When none but God is nigh.

A whisper runs along the grass,
  A tremor of delight;
The tasseled hazel to and fro
Is waving round me as I go;
And now the river, singing low,
  Has flashed upon my sight.

Again I feel my heart o'erflow
  With charity and love,
And know that earth is linked with heaven,
Since to her flowers is beauty given,
  Like the sweet stars above.

Again my mother's whispers fall
  Upon mine eager ear;
Sweet words of counsel or of praise,
Returning from those long past days
  In echoes soft, yet clear.

Thank God, who gives to lowly things
  Such sweet, resistless power!
I feel that highest, holiest thought,
To new existence may be brought
By ministry unknown, unsought,
  Of one pale simple flower!

THE

UNITARIAN.

[From the Christian Reformer for April.]

THE OLD TESTAMENT.*

[CONCLUDED.]

In making these remarks upon the productions of Mr. Norton and Mr. Stuart, we have wandered very far from our original intention in preparing this article; which was to put down a few thoughts of our own on the subject of the relation which the Old-Testament Scriptures should stand to religious faith and conduct under the Christian dispensation. That intention we now proceed in some imperfect measure to fulfil.

Paul, in his Second Epistle to Timothy, says, that "the Holy Scriptures are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus." He thus teaches that the writings of the Old Testament, to which alone he can refer, are intimately connected with Christian truth. They confirm and conduce to the acceptance of that truth, and, in connection with it, become the means of promoting the moral deliverance which the Gospel has in view.

The *evidence*, or, at least, the main and most important evidence, on which we receive the Jewish Scriptures as possessing any thing in the nature of religious authority, is the relation they sustain to Christianity.

* Note.—By an oversight of the Printer, the articles extracted in our first number were not credited to their respective sources, namely: What is Unitarianism?—to the Unitarian for January; The Old Testament—to the Christian Reformer for April; A Few Words about War—to the Unitarian for March; The Primrose—to the same.

The religion made known to us by Christ, we believe to be divine. It sustains, in our estimation, the character of a revelation from on high. It cannot, with any propriety, be disconnected, in this form, from Judaism. It is intimately interwoven with the law and the prophets. It is based upon the system which was delivered by Moses, and gradually unfolded and applied by the sacred writers who succeeded him. It acknowledges the divinity of the truth which they had to administer. To deny that divinity would be not only to deny a portion of the doctrines and principles actually contained in the New Testament, but to reject the foundation upon which Christianity was expressly built. This we cannot do. Our faith in the Gospel forbids it. Howsoever great may be the difficulties attaching to some of the questions which the reception of the Old Testament presents to us, none of them is, or can be, so great as that which would be implied in a renunciation of the divine origin and obligation of the religion of Jesus. It is because "they testify of Christ," that these Scriptures commend themselves to us. It is because we believe that "in these last days God hath spoken to us by his Son," that we assent to the declaration that, "in sundry times and in divers manners, he spake in time past to the fathers by the prophets." What Paul upheld as necessary to Christian faith, we consider to be true. What Jesus relied upon in justification of his pretensions, we reverence as divine.

The *character* we attribute to the writings of the Old Testament is also dependent upon the Christian connection in which they stand. Regarding Christianity as the consummation of those religious communications which God has made for the special instruction of mankind, we look upon Judaism as embracing the necessary preparation for such communications. We recognize in it, as far as that preparation extended, the same religious truth which was afterwards expanded and completed. The same object of worship is presented to

us by it — the same one true and living God, the only Creator and Ruler of the heavens and the earth. The same office and purpose of religion is also fixed by it — the same universal application of the principles of divine love and fear and obedience, to human thought and word and action. In these and other respects, we discover a unity belonging to the system which the Jewish Scriptures exhibit; — a unity strictly preserved amid all the variety of circumstances through which the operation of that system may be observed. In estimating that system, we fix our special notice upon this unity. We do not, however, forget that the preparatory character of the dispensation places many things before us in an exceedingly imperfect form, and involves doctrines and principles with which we have no personal concern. We regard the revelation as at best dim and limited. It is burdened with many matters that were designed to serve merely temporary purposes.

The *use* we should make of the Old-Testament Scriptures is to be explained by the same reference to Christianity, in consistency with which we contemplate their evidence and character. That use of them, and that only, should be made, which Christianity prescribes. What is beneath its truth, should be so regarded and treated What its principles represent as redundant, should be put on one side. What is irreconcilable with or opposed to its brighter light and purer duty, should be rejected. We cannot claim for the Jewish records themselves what is generally understood by inspiration. They describe to us that to which we believe inspiration in various forms attached; but they themselves partake in no small degree of the ignorance and infirmity belonging to the men by whom they were, from time to time, composed. Matters of science, of philosophy, of history, of individual opinion and conduct, which they contain, are to be judged of on the same principles of common sense and rational propriety that are brought to bear upon other documents which, like

them, reflect the knowledge and character of the persons from whom they proceeded. For such things as these, we do not consider the religious truth with which they are connected responsible, any more than we consider ourselves bound to confine our views of religion to the precise representations offered to us by this subordinate system. We set up, as the standard of our judgment in all respects, the manifestation of the glory of God and the duty and destiny of man derived by us from the mission of Christ. By that we interpret all that is doubtful, and add to all that is partial, and correct all that may appear to us erroneous. Whatever purposes Judaism serves, it serves them in entire submission to him who is "the light of the world." The freedom conceded to us by Christianity, we do not renounce in favor of any Jewish bondage, nor can we consent to strain the truth and rectitude of the Gospel so as to produce an exact conformity with Jewish faith and obedience.

We will endeavor to point out, as clearly as we can, the special benefit derivable from the Old-Testament Scriptures, regarded in the light in which we have just placed them. That benefit appears to us to consist, in a great measure, of the means they furnish for concentrating and giving impulse to religious thought and feeling. They form a point around which our religious opinions may collect, and from which we may start in the exercise of religious contemplation. They not only present subjects for such contemplation, but they also supply the standing occasions with which this contemplation naturally connects itself. They constitute an essential part of that which is emphatically *our religious book;* and are thus eminently advantageous toward affording, in a permanent form, matter for religious investigation. The reverence justly attaching to the circumstances under which they were produced, gives a weight to the lessons to be gathered from them, in this relation, which no ordinary representations of reli-

gion, however true they may be, can for a moment be expected to have. The human mind needs something to which it can apply and appeal for the cultivation of its religious interests. If it were, of itself, fully enlightened with regard to those interests — which it is not — they could not be successfully promoted while it was merely thrown upon universal nature for the means and occasions of their promotion. It gains incalculably by having a definite exhibition of the subject of religion about which it may employ itself; and whatever strengthens the associations of respect and deference with which such an exhibition may be connected, will, so far, increase the benefit obtained. We do not, by any means, intend to imply that the purpose we have just pointed out could be properly served by *any kind* of representation of religion in favor of which human reverence might be secured. The false is not, in this respect, to be confounded with the true, nor the evil with the good. It is our opinion, however, that no objection drawn from that view of the case lies against the writings of the Old Testament. Interpreted by Christianity, in entire subserviency to which we alone advocate the use of them, what is derived from them will be invariably true and good. The doctrines they thus teach and the impulses they supply will not only keep the attention fixed upon the subject of religion, but will be accordant with the noblest forms in which religion can be set before us, and the highest objects to which it can be directed. On the other hand, we do not mean to imply by any thing we have said, that the mind of man ought to be bound down, by means of these Scriptures, to other thoughts and feelings, on the subject of religion, than those which commend themselves to its own reason and conscience as true and good. Christianity gives to us this liberty. It is one of its chief purposes with such liberty to make us free. The freedom it allows to reason and conscience, as exercised upon its own revelations, it extends, without let or hind

rance, to all the misrepresentations of religion by which its revelation was preceded. The authority to which it subjects the will is no more, in one case than it is in the other, a slavish authority. It is an authority strictly confined to the responsibilities upon which a man's own sense of duty confers obligation.

It will, perhaps, be asserted, that the New Testament alone would sufficiently serve the purpose we have mentioned, and better serve it *alone* than in connection with these older Scriptures. To this we have to reply, that the New Testament cannot, in consistency with historical truth, be regarded alone. It does not, in fact, stand alone. The events it records, and the doctrines it proclaims, are intimately and indissolubly united with the events and doctrines which the Old Testament makes known. Christianity and Judaism cannot be separated from each other; and if we receive the former as the consummation of religious truth, we are bound, in all propriety, to receive the latter as containing the truth which resulted in and conduced to that consummation. But besides this necessary connection existing between the Old Testament and the New, the Jewish Scriptures have a value of their own, on account of which it may be successfully urged, that the Christian books would not alone sufficiently serve the purpose to which we have referred. They present some questions of religion — those questions which the Mosaic dispensation was immediately designed to settle — in a form no less authoritative than that in which Christianity presents its peculiar revelations. They describe a regular progress experienced by a part of our race, which embraces a development of the religious principle almost unparalleled in interest and importance. To trace that progress, under the impression of the direct divine supervision attaching to it, is to pursue a train of religious thought only next in value to that supplied by Christianity. To familiarize ourselves, by diligent and devout study, with that train of thought, is to have, in a

manner and degree which could not otherwise be obtained, those means and occasions of religious cultivation and improvement upon whose advantage we have been insisting. The purpose of setting before men materials for religious thought and feeling, in a fixed form, to which they may constantly appeal, is thus better served by the Scriptures as we have them, than it could be by the New Testament alone. The fact, that that is a purpose eminently worthy of the Divine interference — proved to be such by the beneficial effects produced through its partial accomplishment — is among the strongest evidences that the whole series of occurrences related in these Scriptures, happened under that immediate providential direction and appointment which are claimed in their favor.

If it be true that the human mind needs a stay for its religious thoughts and feelings — a centre around which they may collect — a point from which they may start — if it be true that the whole volume of the Scriptures is necessary to supply this place, and that it thus contributes permanently to the religious education of man, — then it naturally follows, that this volume is especially suited to the wants of childhood. It is not in the light of a mere passing allusion that we are disposed to regard those words of Paul, in which he congratulates Timothy on the circumstance, that "*from a child* he had known the Holy Scriptures." It is at this period of life that the intellect and the heart can be best, and indeed can only be with any certain prospect of success, moulded to the purposes which ought to distinguish the man. If there be any purpose worthy of such distinction, it is that of steady moral cultivation under the pervading influence of religious principle. To be furnished with such principle, is to have a rule of constant restraint and guidance applicable to every circumstance in which we can be placed. To accustom the child to read and study, to investigate and reflect upon and apply, the facts and truths he may find in the Bible, is so to put

this rule into his hands, that it may be always ready for his practical use. We advocate, therefore, an education intimately connected with the knowledge and employment of the Scriptures. We do so that the child may be habituated to religious consideration, and furnished with the materials of such consideration throughout his after-days. We do not mean that Biblical instruction should be communicated to him indiscriminately. What is done in this respect, should be done with wisdom and prudence. The child should be taught to distinguish here, as elsewhere, between things that differ, and to exercise intelligence upon whatever is brought before him. Above all, he should be taught to subordinate every thing with which he meets in the Scriptures to the cardinal principles of religion, as they are developed in the character and ministry of Christ. With such understanding, we do, however, contend, that at the opening of life the mind should be led into and impressed by this collection of facts and teachings, whose value lies in the permanent character it may sustain, as affording one of the chief means and occasions of religious cultivation. We are far from anticipating any danger from the course we recommend. We believe experience will fully prove that the moral perversion which has sometimes been attributed to the use of the Bible on the part of the child, can scarcely take place. That volume contains its own corrective on this point, and nothing but a disposition bent upon wickedness will extract from it false and vicious lessons. Instructed to interpret it in the intelligent and comprehensive manner to which we have referred, the child — whose confiding simplicity is always attended with acute moral discernment — will draw from it nothing but the good, which in its influence upon the spiritual being will be as angels' food. A child is not sensible to many things which offend the taste of an adult. This is especially the case with ideas whose tendency is toward sensualism. We heard a gentleman, some time ago,

express great surprise at the amount of impurity he had met with in reading the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments.* He said he had not previously read the book since he was a child, and that then he had found in it nothing of the kind. His mind was not then open to the evil impressions to which a more mature age exposed him. As it is with sensuality, so it is with philosophical objections. The child does not entertain such objections. There is a striking passage to this effect in that beautiful book, *The Diary of Lady Willoughby.* It is as follows :

"A child's mind stops not at difficulties as ours does: when told that God heareth prayer from his throne in heaven, the belief is entire, and she questioneth not. I verily believe the doctrine, that we should walk by faith, and not by sight, is easier to a young child than to us, whose affections have become engrafted on earthly objects, and the first simplicity of faith obscured. And surely we should consider it a sacred trust given to us, to direct this inborn trust and ready belief of the little child to *Him* who implanted it."

The application of such sentiments as these to the purely beneficial connection which may be established between the Scriptures and childhood, need not be pointed out. Our feelings respond to the truth of this subject immediately on its being suggested to us. Great as are the attractions of the New Testament for the purpose of religious education — powerful as is the influence of the tale of Christianity there recorded, when brought into contact with the moral nature of the child — the Old Testament has powerful attractions tending to the same end, which ought not to be disparaged in the comparison. Its histories of long past time lay hold of the imagination with a strength peculiar to themselves. Its full-toned devotion subdues the heart to a depth of pious feeling, the experience of which may in vain be hoped for in any other connection. Of the effect of these things the child is peculiarly susceptible. Its imagination is easily excited. Its heart naturally answers

to the touch of piety. Believing, therefore, in the utility of these ancient Scriptures to all purposes of holy conversation and godliness, we do not hesitate to employ, with regard to them, the language of the Jewish lawgiver on the point now under consideration: "These words which I command thee shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up."

It is very easy to make formidable objections to these Old-Testament Scriptures. It is very difficult — perhaps impossible — to answer all that may be said against them. We believe, however, that the existing difficulties could not but exist. The long time which has elapsed since these books were composed, is sufficient to account for most of these difficulties. If God has seen fit to make known his character and will in this form, surely the communication ought not to be treated with neglect, because of difficulties that are but natural to the case. A faith built upon the Christian connection, and the religious value attaching to these Scriptures, should be retained as long as these arguments remain unshaken. As to matters that cannot be clearly explained, the suggestions of unbelief may be wisely resisted on the ground of the injury to a practical connection with the Bible, which the encouragement of such unbelief produces. The importance belonging to the preservation of faith in this instance, should lead to a demand for plain and strong reasons indeed, before it be cast away. Mr. Stuart makes some impressive remarks upon the manner in which Scripture difficulties should be met.

"My experience," says he, "has taught me something in relation to such subjects. In the early part of my Biblical studies, some 30 – 35 years ago, when I first began the critical investigation of the Scriptures, doubts and difficulties started up on every side, like the armed men whom Cadmus is fabled to have raised up. Time, patience, continued study, a better acquaintance with the original Scriptural languages, and the countries

where the sacred books were written, have scattered to the winds nearly all these doubts. I meet indeed with difficulties still, which I cannot solve at once; with some, where even repeated efforts have not solved them. But I quiet myself by calling to mind, that hosts of other difficulties, once apparently to me as formidable as these, have been removed, and have disappeared from the circle of my troubled vision. Why may I not hope, then, as to the difficulties that remain? Every year is now casting some new light on the Bible, and making plain some things which aforetime were either not understood, or were misunderstood. Why may not my difficulties be reached by some future progressive increase of light? At least, in the revolution of the sun, the dark spots will sooner or later disappear. And, what is more than all considerations of this kind, speedily the whole will be known. In the light of heaven, no darkness is intermingled. Soon the anxious and devoted inquirer after truth will, if a true Christian, enjoy the opportunity of asking the writers themselves of the books of Scripture, what they intended and what they designed to teach. It is good, I do believe, both to hope and patiently wait for the light of eternal day, if, after all our efforts to clear up a few difficulties in Scripture that remain, we do not succeed to our utmost wishes." — P. 18.

To what we have just said in favor of the position, that faith in these Old-Testament writings ought not on light grounds to be abandoned, we would particularly add, that a gracious and generous spirit should be exercised in their interpretation. This will be the best means of resolving our own doubts, and resisting the cavils of others. To judge kindly and charitably — to explain liberally and sympathize freely — to have minds ready to be satisfied with reasonable answers to objections, and hearts open to the impressions of truth and goodness — to keep steadily in view great principles — to reject all that is captious in argument, cold in feeling, and of minor value in its application to the questions in hand — this will be the way at once to hold fast our confidence in what the Bible lays before us, and to derive from it all the instruction and blessing it is calculated to communicate. If the conclusions of the intellect, on this subject, are formed under the direction of a benevolent and magnanimous heart — if love unite

itself with truth in our investigations — there is nothing to be feared from the closest examination we may institute. It is only necessary to bring into operation a noble and friendly temper, in order to gather from these holy Scriptures that "wisdom unto salvation" which they are designed and adapted to yield.

Destitute of the whole volume of the sacred writings — writings so incomparable for their simplicity and power — so interesting both in themselves and in the associations with which they are connected — so promotive at once of piety and virtue — so enlightening to the intellect and so strengthening to the heart — so fruitful in the production of truth and purity and goodness — how comparatively dark would our condition have been! From what other source could the mass of the people have learned the mighty truths concerning the Father of all — the grand principles of morality — the vast revelation of an eternal state? The humblest peasant in our favored land, has access, by means of the Bible, to the clearest and most elevated expositions of high and holy matters, which the acutest intellect and the most extensive learning of antiquity failed to comprehend. His mind may thus be furnished with the surest and most satisfactory information as to his nature and station, his relations and destiny. His lot, however low it may be, need not hinder him from fully availing himself of that information. While he thus gains religious knowledge, he undergoes a mental discipline of the highest order, and acquaints himself with principles of universal bearing which tend to his spiritual cultivation, in the most general sense of that term. We have to thank God that the progress of events has placed these sacred books, translated into our native tongue, within the reach of all. We thus possess a national treasure, which both in itself, and in its effect upon the whole circle of our interests, is "more precious than gold, yea, than much fine gold," and with which indeed, no earthly wealth ought for a moment to be compared.

r.

[From the Inquirer (London), No. 199.]

A Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion. By THEODORE PARKER, Minister of the Second Church in Roxbury, Mass. London: Chapman, Brothers, Newgate-Street. 1846.

THE appearance of a handsome London edition of this remarkable work, invites us to say something of its character and influences. That it is beautifully written is beyond question, and though the style is artificial and affected, it cannot be denied that it presents the author's thoughts in such a forcible manner, and with such rich and varied illustration, as to engage attention, and confer pleasure. In many things also we feel with Mr. Parker, and believe him to be uttering important truths, in opposition to prevalent error. On the whole, however, we must say, that our judgment of the book is unfavorable, as to its tendency and prevailing effect on the minds of readers, and as to the truth of its most characteristic opinions. It represents, in the first place, that both the religious sentiment and the moral sense are innate, fundamental, and universal principles of human nature. There may, no doubt, be a sense in which this is true, for the common faculties and common circumstances of human beings cause, in nearly all instances, the development of certain sentiments and feelings which come under the classes named religious and moral; but though bearing a certain resemblance, these sentiments are really different in the different cases, and being complex feelings, gradually formed and liable to much variation, they by no means justify the theory of certain sentiments being innate and universal. Granting that all known nations, notwithstanding what is affirmed of some of them by travellers, manifest sentiments properly referred to the class religious, it still needs to be noted, that these sentiments are by no means identical; and such as they are, may be traced in their gradual for-

mation by the union of different elements. It is not true that there is either a religious or a moral sentiment implanted in us, which is sufficient for our guidance, or the existence of which is any sufficient security — we will not say only *against* the occurrence of the grossest errors in religion and morals, but *for* that progress which seems to be the appointed plan for the attainment of whatever excellence our nature is capable of.

Mr. Parker's theory settles easily enough — were it only satisfactorily — the great question respecting the truth of *Revelation* : —

"There can be," he says, "but one kind of religion, as there can be but one kind of time and space. It may exist in different degrees, weak or powerful; in combination with other sentiments — love or hate, with wisdom or folly; and thus it is superficially modified, just as love, which is always the same thing, is modified by the character of the man who feels it, and by that of the object to which it is directed. Of course, then, there is no difference but of words between *Revealed* Religion and *Natural* Religion; for all actual religion is revealed in us, or it could not be felt, and all revealed religion is natural, or it would be of no use."

The author adds this note : —

"This distinction between natural and revealed religion is very old. But it is evidently a distinction in *form*, not in *substance*. The terms seem to have arisen from taking an exclusive view of some *positive* and *historical* form of religion: all religions claim to have been *revealed*."

This is a favorite style of talking with the school to which Mr. Parker belongs, and many have been deluded by it; yet it seems to us not difficult to disentangle the sophistry. The uniformity of the religious sentiment in mankind is proved by experience to be a false assumption. There is enough common in the purest and most exalted theism and the grossest idolatry, for both to receive the name of religion; but nothing can be more different than their effects or than their evidence.

We may, if we please, speak of all actual religion as being revealed in us, that is, becoming in some way

known to us, otherwise it could have no existence; but this is mere sporting with words. The word *reveal*, when applied to this subject, has a well-known *technical* meaning, which is, to make known immediately and extraordinarily — to communicate from God — not as everything is communicated by him, according to what we term the laws of nature — but by an express action, in apparent violation of them, giving a stimulus from without to aid the progress of our race. *Revelation* may be utterly denied, and the cases referred to it may be maintained to fall within the ordinary laws of nature; but nothing is gained in the consideration of the question by a confusion of language. The term should be employed in its recognised sense by those who oppose as by those who defend it. The author affirms, that natural and revealed religion must be the same. They must certainly be *consistent*, if both are true. But the natural religion of different individuals is not the same when one knows more than the others, though whatever truth each possesses is consistent, and the same so far as both possess it. The notion of revealed religion amongst its rational defenders is, that in order to human progress, God was pleased to communicate in an extraordinary and supernatural manner, truths additional to those ascertained by natural means, or corrections of errors naturally arising out of the condition of man in an early stage of progress. The pretension may be true or false, but it surely is intelligible; and the difference between natural and revealed religion consists partly in the means by which each is obtained, partly in the number of truths or the proportion of truth to error in the two methods. Many religions, i. e., many distinct forms of religion, have claimed to be revealed. It is a question of evidence in each case. Mr. Parker's view decides that none of them can have a just claim. We reject the pretensions of the greater number, but admit a series of direct divine interferences to aid and stimulate human progress in the cultivation, purification, and application of religious sentiments.

We cannot pretend here to enter on the nature and amount of the evidence in the case; but the real nature and intent of Mr. Parker's book must not be mistaken: he considers the leading teachings of Christ as truths, and may, therefore, account himself a disciple of Christ: but he is not a believer in revealed religion, and his view of Christianity, of its authority and its value, is altogether different from that entertained by all who regard Christ as a special messenger of God. With such thinkers as Mr. Parker, the authority of Christ is of the same kind with that of Socrates, of Milton, or of any great and good man who has used an influence in the world: he thinks that our perception of the truth of the teachings of Christianity constitutes its authority, instead of the sanction of external evidence inducing us to accept and reverently apply its teachings. This view we must consider as a pernicious error, altogether taking away the peculiar value of the Christian religion, and, at the same time, introducing inconsistency into the character of the founder and first teacher of our religion, and making the history of its origin no better than a tissue of fables. What we maintain is, that the philosophy of Mr. Parker's system is false and delusive; that he has left the analytical study of the human mind for the rash assumptions and verbal delusions of a fanciful transcendental metaphysics; and that he has thus made shipwreck of a faith, which is as rational as it is useful and delightful. We would not proscribe this book, nor lose the benefit of its just sentiments and beauties of thought and language, but neither would we have it misunderstood; let it be calmly considered; let the thoughtful reader go to first principles, and consider them well, and we have no fears for the result. We think that though Mr. Parker holds in general the same sentiments with ourselves, on morals, Providence, the honor to be paid to the Great Supreme, and the duties and prospects of man, he most dangerously alters the grounds of religious faith, and the means

of religious influence : what he says is to be considered with much seriousness of mind, and ought not to be admitted without being very carefully weighed. If certain metaphysical doctrines which have lately acquired some degree of popularity be true, it is probable Mr. Parker may be right ; but if we see anything clearly of the nature of the human mind, a foundation is still left for a supernatural and properly Divine system of religion, such as it seems to us most evident that Christianity pretends to be, and such as we believe that human beings need. We have full confidence in this divine religion maintaining its ground against all the inroads of false philosophy ; but whilst ready to submit it to every fair test of examination, and only desiring it to prevail by its evidence and utility, we are anxious, we confess, that it should not be really abandoned, whilst nominally retained, through the perverting influence of such a system as is put forth in this volume. We are also very desirous that Christian Unitarianism should not come in for any part of the praise or blame which may be judged to belong to Mr. Parker's doctrines, being, as it is in fact, a totally different, and in our humble judgment, a far more rational, beneficial, and consolatory system, founded on a more solid basis, and better adapted to the wants of our nature.

SELECTIONS.

Sorrow for sin is not repentance. Repentance is a great volume of duty; and godly sorrow is but the frontispiece or title page; it is the harbinger or first introduction to it. — *Taylor.*

There is no occasion to affect a singularity of behavior, nor seek for uncommon ways of employing our time, in order to live a life of holiness: there needs only to consider the station wherein we are placed as the call of God; and to acquaint ourselves in all the parts of it, momentous or trivial, in such a manner, as that we could not have done better upon the occasion, all circumstances regarded.—*Tucker.*

[From the London Inquirer, No. 201.]

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

The forty-third anniversary meeting of this Society was held at Exeter-hall on Wednesday. Amongst those seated on the platform, were the following friends and supporters of the institution:— The Marquis of Cholmondeley, Lord Teignmouth, Lord Sandon, Lord Ashley, the bishops of Winchester, Norwich, and Calcutta, the Hon. Baptist Noel, Mr. Plumptre, M.P., J. Harford, Esq., &c. &c.

A letter from the President was read by the Rev. Mr. Brandram, the Secretary of the Society, in which his lordship regretted his inability to attend and preside over the meeting, but expressed his continued and unabated attachment to the Society.

It was then moved and agreed that Lord Sandon should take the chair.

The Chairman, after some introductory observations expressing his attachment to the Society, said: These are not times when any man should shrink from declaring his attachment to the principles of the Bible Society. If those principles were indisputable seventy years ago, what shall we say of them at the present moment, when attempts are being made from within and without, to diminish in some degree the urgency of that declaration of my own Church, that as regards faith and doctrine we have no right to consider anything as necessary to salvation which is not contained in the Holy Scriptures—(cheers.) Upon this point we all find common ground on which to rest our feet, and to co-operate zealously, heartily, and undoubtingly in the work of diffusing the word of God; and every step we take is one which more and more unites every section of Christians in one common feeling, and counteracts in some degree the tendency which is strongly prevalent amongst us, to look too much to our sectional diversities and differences of opinion—(cheers). With respect to other Mission-

ary Societies we may differ, but with regard to this great fundamental Missionary Society we cannot differ — (cheers). Why, who are our missionaries? Are they not the prophets, the evangelists, and the apostles —(hear, hear). And can any man doubt that these are missionaries with whom we may all co-operate to send abroad? Can we doubt that those who though dead, yet speak as they did while they were yet living, will produce conviction in the minds of those whom they address, and that the ultimate effect will be the conversion of the whole world—(hear, hear). Ladies and gentlemen, I do not wish longer to interpose between you and those to whose voices you have often listened with great satisfaction on former occasions, who will tell you what the Society has done and is doing, and will rejoice and cheer your hearts in days of doubt, of difficulty, and of division, with reports from every part of the world of those great acts of brotherly love, of Christian charity, and of faith, in which your Society has been successfully engaged. While statesmen look to the growing exports of our country,—while we all feel cheered by manifestations of our increasing commercial prosperity,—it is delightful to be able to turn to the statistics of the Bible Society with the same satisfaction, and to mark the great progress which it has been privileged to make in every part of the world. I therefore call upon you to listen to the report, which will now be presented to you by the Secretary.

The Secretary then read a letter from the Bishop of Chester, expressing regret at his unavoidable absence; and from J. J. Gurney, Esq., to the same purpose, and also containing a donation of £100.

The Rev. Gentlemen then read the Report, detailing the operations of the Society's agents in France, Holland, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, and other European countries, and also in China and the East. Under the head of Germany, it was stated, that Dr. Pinkerton had, on behalf of the Society,

held interviews with the elders and leaders of the German Reformed Catholics, who expressed their willingness to accept the Lutheran version of the Bible in preference to that which had hitherto been used. The following statement presents a complete view of the Society's receipts, issue, and expenditure:—

"The entire receipts of the year amount to £101,305. 15s.; being an excess over the previous year of £3,550. 4s. 2d. This increase has chiefly taken place in the free contributions from Auxiliary Societies, and receipts for Bibles and Testaments. The receipts for Bibles and Testaments during the year have amounted to £55,976. 10s. 9d.; being an increase over the preceding year of £8,076. 16s. 11d. The total sum applicable to the general purposes of the Society is £45,329. 4s. 3d., including £33,022. 9s. 3d. free contributions from Auxiliary Societies; being an excess of £1,473. 18s. 8d. over the free contributions from Auxiliary Societies of the preceding year.

"The issues of the Society have amounted to 1,441,651; namely, from the Depository at home, 1,104,787; from depots abroad, 336,864; being 525,840 copies more than in the preceding year. The total issues of the Society have been 18,324,487 volumes. The expenditure during the past year has been £105,851. 2s. 9d.; being £20,033. 7s. more than the previous year. The engagements of the Society exceed £56,730. 0s. 7d."

The Marquis of Cholmondeley said: I have great pleasure in moving,

"That the Report, an abstract of which has been read, be received, and printed under the direction of the Committee."

The very remarkable demand which has recently arisen in the north of England, and especially among the operatives of Manchester, for the Scriptures, affords a most blessed assurance of the progress of our cause. This demand may be regarded as a token of good, not

only to this country, but considering the influence which this country has over other nations, it may, I think, be considered a token of vast spiritual good to the world at large—(cheers). Having on several occasions taken part in meetings of this Society, I can truly say, that never was I more deeply impressed with the wisdom of the principles on which it is founded, or with the sublimity of the object which occupies its attention. I humbly trust, my lord, that it will continue to prosper, scattering far and wide that blessed volume which, under the influence of the blessed Spirit who inspired it, is calculated to make men wise unto salvation, through faith in Christ Jesus—(cheers).

The Lord Bishop of Calcutta seconded the resolution, making a few remarks on the extension of the Society's operations in India.

The resolution was then put, and carried unanimously.

Lord Ashley proposed the second resolution. His lordship said: It will not, I hope, be imputed to disrespect, if the observations which I address to this meeting are exceedingly brief, because public business of great importance will call me away almost immediately. I did fear that I should not be able to attend this great anniversary; but when I recollected that I had so recently joined the Parent Society, and that it had done me the honor of raising me to the truly dignified post of one of its vice-presidents, I did think that I ought to come here to express, in the most sincere and emphatic language, the very deep esteem which I entertain for its operations, and for those who conduct them, and to declare that I do adopt the motto of some peer whose name I now forget, "*Sed sero serio.*" My lord, I was deeply affected by the language of the venerable prelate who has just sat down—(hear, hear). I do rejoice in having heard from him a statement of what has taken place in that great field of missionary operations; I do rejoice that he has been spared, by the mercy of Al-

mighty God, after fourteen years of evangelical service, to return to this country, to give us a narrative of his personal experience, to tell us what has been done by the efforts of this great Society, to encourage us to persevere, and once more to give us the opportunity of taking leave of him in the flesh before he returns to that post to which he has been called by Providence, there to finish the course that he has so nobly begun—(cheers). Now my lord, the resolution which I have to move tells so well its own story, and sets forth so clearly its own purport, that I might spare myself and you the trouble of any observations. The resolution is this :—"That this Society being established for the simple purpose of promoting a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures, its members now assembled cannot but regard the remarkable increase in the issues of the past year indicative of the Divine blessing attendant on their labors, while they would at the same time be reminded, that the wants of the sacred volume are still far from being adequately met even in our own country, and that it is their bounden duty, in this respect, to forget the things that are behind, and in a spirit of dependence upon the great Head of the Church, to reach forth unto the things that are before them." Now, these words are clear and emphatic, and might, as I said before, spare you and me the trouble of any remarks of my own. But I cannot, in a meeting of this Society, or of any kindred society, refrain from expressing the deep and extreme joy which I feel when I have to speak on behalf of associations founded as this is upon the great and unchangeable spirit of the Protestant religion—(cheers). This Society stands upon that basis ; its vital principle is Protestanism ; it exists, and can only exist, in full and in free operation, when encircled by a Protestant atmosphere—(great cheering). It does declare the great and leading principle of the all-sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures ; it does declare the right of private judgment ; it does assert the duty and

necessity of the universal distribution of the Word of God; it does moreover declare that the Scriptures shall be read, studied, and understood of the people, and that they shall be placed in the hands of every human being, from the king that sitteth upon the throne, to the maid that grindeth behind the mill. Now, my lord, it is not only at all times a great source of pleasure to me to assert these principles, but in these days my testimony is beyond my own control, I cannot keep it back; and by the blessing of God, wherever I am, and whatever I may be called upon to do, I will stand up for these great and unchangeable principles—(cheers). Aye, my lord, these are the great principles that were developed and enforced at the blessed Reformation; these are the great principles that have made this empire what it is. It is for the assertion of these principles, for the maintenance and diffusion of these truths, that we have been invested with wealth, and with dignity, and with power; in proportion as we decline in the assertion of them, will this empire decline—(hear, hear). If ever the time come when we shall be ashamed to maintain such a Society as this, established for such a purpose, why then I do believe that the period will have arrived at which we shall sink down, and most deservedly, too, into the condition of a feeble and a third-rate power—(hear, hear). But how, my lord, must not this Society rejoice, when they look at the mighty increase in the issue of Bibles in the past year! Must they not rejoice at the principle upon which the institution is founded, and the mode in which its operations are conducted? Humanly speaking, what but such a Society as this could have produced such a desire for the Word of God? and what but such a Society as this could have instantly met that great and almost overwhelming demand—(hear, hear). I do hope, and I do believe, that this, by God's blessing, is a new—may be the beginning of a new—era in the history of these realms. We are living in a period of great progress—we hear of

literature for the million, food for the million, many things for the million, and I rejoice in them all; but I do hope we shall soon see what may be called Bible Associations for the million, because then, not only shall we enlist a large proportion of the working people in the support of the operations of this Society, but if we could but get from the million, as it is termed, one shilling each, we should, by that circumstance alone, have added to our yearly contributions exactly one-half of that which we now receive. Now, my lord, I do sincerely hope, that in affirming this resolution, the great assembly here met together will not affirm it merely in words, but will affirm it by their redoubled exertions, and that they will endeavor to re-fill the emptied storehouses of the Bible Society,—emptied by such a cause and by such means, and endeavor to increase ten-fold or twenty-fold the former amount. And, my lord, I hope that when hereafter continental protentates and distinguished foreigners shall come to this land, to see what is the mainspring of our wealth, and the secret of our strength, after showing them our arsenals, and our docks, and our ships, and our manufactories, and all our means of external and of internal government, we shall at last take them to the storehouse of the Bible Society, and point out to them a hundred Bibles in a hundred languages, and point out to them the endeavor that is made by this great Society to provide that there shall be Bibles in all languages for the teaching of all nations, in fulfilment of the last command of our blessed Lord; and then may we also tell them, that politically as well as spiritually, to nations as well as to individuals, the Word of God has been, and ever will be, a buckler, a refuge, a fortress, and a defence—(great applause).

The Rev. Dr. Gray, of Edinburgh, seconded the resolution, which was put, and carried unanimously.

The Rev. J. Blackburn, Independent Minister of Pentonville, said: I have the honor, my lord, to propose the following resolution:—"That the thanks

of this meeting be given to the Right Honorable the President, the Right Reverend, Right Honorable, and others, the Vice-Presidents, for their continued patronage and support." This resolution he supported in a speech of some length, in the course of which he proposed that the Bible Society should publish a new Polyglot.

The Rev. Professor Fleidner, from Prussia, briefly seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

The Secretary stated, in reference to an allusion of the Rev. J. Blackburn, that no poor student or pastor had ever applied to the Society for the Scriptures in the original Hebrew, Greek, Syriac, or Arabic, or in other language, without obtaining them. He would not trust himself to speak on the subject of the Polyglot.

The Rev. Dr. Alder, Secretary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, moved the following resolution :— "That the thanks of this meeting be given to the Treasurer and Committee for their attention in conducting the concerns of the Society, that the Treasurer be requested to continue his services, and that the following gentlemen be the Committee for the ensuing year, with power to fill up vacancies." [Names read.] Amongst other observations, the reverend gentleman said : This is a Society for the world. Originating like a speck on the horizon, its appearance was not at first noticed, except by a few of the lovers of Zion, who anxiously watched its progress, and rejoiced, that amid the din of arms, and the conflicts of contending nations, God was in this way making provision for the dissemination of his truth amongst mankind. The cloud has since been greatly enlarged, but it must be much further extended over the heavens, in order that its blessed contents may drop as the rain, and distil as the dew on all the nations of the earth. I am, my lord, more anxious to impress this consideration on the minds of those whom I am now addressing, because an

opinion seems to exist in some quarters, that the increase of missionary effort has diminished the necessity which existed for the operations of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Undoubtedly the preaching of the Gospel by the living voice is God's ordinary method of bringing men to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, and we rejoice to know that many messengers of the Truth are running to and fro on the earth, and that by their instrumentality Christian knowledge is greatly increased. It were, however, a very erroneous and dangerous inference, to draw from such a fact, that the necessity for the existence and operations of such an institution as this is thereby diminished. My lord, the reverse is the case—(hear, hear)—the prosperity of British missions strengthens the claims of the British and Foreign Bible Society on the sympathies and efforts of the British public, because this prosperity increases its liabilities. Nor, my lord, is this to be wondered at; for the word of truth is not only the instrument of forming a new nature in man, but it constitutes the aliment by which that nature is sustained and strengthened; so that when an individual is begotten again to a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, whether he be a polished European, or an untutored barbarian, he desires the sincere milk of the Word, that he may be enabled to grow thereby; and when he reaches the state of spiritual manhood, it is the Word that furnishes the food by which he is sustained and strengthened. In order to illustrate the truth of the principle for which I am contending, I will relate an anecdote which was told to myself by one of our missionaries from the Friendly Islands. The Gospel of Jesus Christ was introduced into these islands some years ago, by a number of missionaries; and the blessing of God so attended their labors, that the entire population renounced idolatry, and were brought under either the direct or indirect influence of the truth as it is in Jesus. Some time

afterwards, in a list of goods which were required, was found an order for thirty-six dozen of spectacles, six dozen for six different stations. Now, who wanted those spectacles? Why, the venerable scholars who attended the mission schools—(hear, hear). And what was it that triumphed over the power of habit? What was it that triumphed over long-established indifference? What was it that brought these individuals to submit to all the restraints of a school at such an advanced period of life? Why, my lord, it was the influence of the love of God and his Word; they sought to acquire the art of reading as a means to an end—the end being that they, in their old age, might read for themselves, and in their own tongue, the book which had God for its author—man's salvation for its object—(cheers). It was the influence of the new affection mysteriously awakened in their hearts in the first instance by the power of truth and the Spirit of God, which raised them above their former selves—the only means, permit me to say, which can elevate human nature above itself in any case—(hear). It is evident, then, my lord, that if missionary operations are to be extended, the friends of the Bible Society must increase their efforts and enlarge their contributions. If missionaries translate the Word of God into different languages, to whom do they look for help to enable them to circulate the Holy Scriptures so translated?—to the British and Foreign Bible Society. Nor do not look in vain: the funds of the Society are, to a certain extent, always placed at their disposal when they have made out a case which justifies the committee in making such an appropriation. It is well known that the agents of the Papacy, on hearing of the success of the Protestant missions in New Zealand, proceeded thither; but before they commenced their operations, this noble institution, through the medium of the Church Missionary Society, and the Wesleyan Missionary Society, had sent out many thousands of copies of the New Testament, in the lan-

guage of the New Zealanders, for distribution amongst that people. What is the consequence of that? Why, that so far as this Society is concerned, it does not appear that the agents of the Papacy have succeeded in seducing one single person from the truth as it is in Jesus. When they have endeavored to draw the natives away from the fold with which they had connected themselves, those whom they have addressed, after listening quietly to their statements, have simply taken the New Testament out of their pockets, and said, "It may be all very well, but it is not in the book;" and not being in the book, they would not receive it as religious truth—(hear, hear). So that, under God, this Society has assisted in preserving those simple-minded persons from the influence of error, and in preserving them steadfast in the truth—(cheers). Another motive for enlarging our contributions to this Society, is to be found in the consideration, that amidst all the divisions, strifes, and dissensions which unhappily agitate the Christian Church, a conviction is spreading, at home and abroad, that if the Christian religion is to be found anywhere, it is not in human creeds, however excellent, nor in the decrees of councils, nor in the sayings and writings of men, but in the inspired oracles of the living God; and just in proportion as this sentiment prevails—and I believe it will prevail most extensively—will the demand for Bibles and Testaments be increased. I connect this sentiment with the movement at Manchester, and in other parts of the manufacturing districts, and with the mighty movement now going on in Germany and in other continental countries; for, though we cannot look with feelings of universal satisfaction on these latter movements, yet considering the state of the world and of the Church, it is something that men manifest the spirit of inquiry; and when they inquire where truth is found, the British Society can reply, "Here, in the book which we put into your hands"—(hear, hear). While some are calling out for

the crucifix, millions are exclaiming, "We want the Word of God;" while a few voices cry out for pictures, numbers say, "We want spiritual realities;" while there are those who say, "Hear the Church," we too, say, "Hear the Church, but hear it in subordination to the Bible, and to the Saviour whom the Bible presents—(applause). Let us take for our watchword, "the Bible for the world!" "Education for the world," say some; so say we,—but education in accordance with the word of God! "Political institutions for the world," say others; so say we,—but political institutions based on the oracles of truth—(loud applause).

The Rev. Dr. Glegg, from China, seconded the resolution, which was put and carried.

John Harford, Esq., moved the following resolution: "That this meeting would tender a renewed and sincere tribute of gratitude to the Auxiliaries, Branch Societies, and Ladies' Bible Associations throughout the country, and would entreat at the hands of their officers, committees, and collectors, a continuance of their services, which tended so greatly to the increased circulation of the Sacred Volume during the past year, and to the increase of the free contributions."

The resolution having been seconded by the Rev. Mr. Brandram, the Secretary, was put and carried.

Lord Teignmouth proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman, which was seconded by Sir Digby Mackeworth, and carried by acclamation.

The Chairman briefly acknowledged the resolution, and the meeting separated.

[From the Unitarian, (London) May, 1846.]

POLITICAL PIETY.

AS EXEMPLIFIED IN THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY'S PRAYER OF THANKSGIVING FOR VICTORY OVER THE SIKHS; "SAID" ON SUNDAY, APRIL 11, 1846.—BY THE REV. J. R. BEARD, D.D.

MATT. v. 43, 44, 45—"Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them who despitefully use you and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven, for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."

So spake the Light and the Saviour of the world, with an elevation, purity, and largeness of heart, that are as beautiful and touching as they are original. Let us now hear the words of His chief successor, and approved representative in these dominions:

O Lord, God of hosts, in whose hand is power and might irresistible, we, Thine unworthy servants, most humbly acknowledge Thy goodness in the victories lately vouchsafed to the armies of our Sovereign over a host of barbarous invaders, who sought to spread desolation through fruitful and populous provinces enjoying the blessings of peace under the protection of the British Crown. We bless Thee, O merciful Lord, for having brought to a speedy and prosperous issue a war to which no occasion had been given by injustice on our part, or apprehension of injury at our hands. To Thee, O Lord, we ascribe the glory; it was thy wisdom which guided the councils, Thy power which strengthened the hands of those whom it pleased Thee to use as Thy instruments in the discomfiture of the lawless aggressor, and the prostration of his ambitious designs. From Thee alone cometh the victory, and the spirit of moderation and mercy in the day of success. Continue, we beseech Thee, to go forth with our armies whensoever they are called into battle in a righteous cause; and dispose the hearts of their leaders to exact nothing more from the vanquished than is necessary for the maintenance of peace and security against violence and rapine.

England, it appears, was in the very position contemplated by the Lord Jesus Christ. She had an enemy: what was her course? An ancient disciple of the same high authority, that bade Christians love their enemies, entered into particulars, and explained the nature of the love required. Paul enjoins, "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves; if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing, thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." (Rom. x. 19, 21.) Here, then, we have in the clearest and the fullest terms, the instructions of Jesus, the Head of the Church, and of Paul, His Apostle to the Gentiles, touching the conduct we should observe towards our enemies. What has Eng-

land done? She has acted in direct opposition to the spirit and the letter of these precepts. Instead of loving, she has done her utmost to destroy this enemy. He was an hungered, and she gave him no meat; thirsty, and she gave him no drink; on the contrary, for bread she gave him a bullet, and a bayonet instead of the wish of peace; and that, too, though the Judge of all the earth has added, "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." (Matt. xxv. end.) I know not how any teaching can be more plain, simple, emphatic. I know not how duty can be more explicitly set forth. I know not how human obligations can be more strongly enforced. Nor do I know what Christianity is, if this is not at least an essential feature of Christianity. I am equally at a loss to say how these explicit injunctions can by any ingenuity be explained away. There they stand, free from ambiguity, as clear as the love is pure and lofty which they recommend. You may deny the authority of the speakers, and so get rid of the precept. But what shall be said of *his* consistency, who, admitting the authority, contravenes the precept? Has not the Saviour expressly condemned those who called Him "Lord, Lord," but did not the things which he commanded? Notwithstanding these facts, England has again slaughtered, instead of loving her enemies. Perhaps, however, it is a solitary act? It is part of a long-continued, and carefully supported system. Perhaps it is the outburst of a sudden passion? It is the natural and inevitable consequence of a deliberate plan. At any rate, it is the act of soldiers — men more distinguished for bravery than Christian knowledge. The Church of this country is part and parcel of the British Constitution. Why are our bishops near the throne? Why do they sit in the chair of authority, and the upper hall of the Legislature? And what else than what our priests have made it — our priests located in every district and corner of the land — what else is the general character of this nation, which, while proud of the name of Christian, sanctions and supports the war proceedings of our legislators, and hates, starves, and destroys, instead of loving its enemies. But the concurrence of its spiritual guides in the recent sanguinary deeds on the Indian Sutlej is, alas! put beyond a doubt by the prayer issued at the command of her Majesty by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and recited on the last Lord's-day in every church and chapel in England and Wales. Here the head of the Anglican Church appears in his own proper person, and in words which he either wrote or adopted, expresses his entire approval of the aims and purposes of the conquerors, and, by implication, of the passions which raged in their breasts, and the deeds of blood and death which they performed. It may, indeed, be pleaded, that the Archbishop wrote not spontaneously, but on the command of his Sovereign. What then, is it an extenuation that a teacher of the people teaches error only when expressly bidden; that a minister of Christ stirs himself up to pray when political

influences bear upon him? Is true piety the offspring of command? Can it be prepared and vended as a merchandise? Is gratitude to God dependent in its flow on the fountain head of civil power? This political piety is most spurious. Where in the New Testament is the precedent for this union of devotion and regal authority — of blood and prayer? The High Priest who put forth this form of supplication may have complied with the claims of his duty as a subject to an earthly potentate, but how stands he in the sight of the King of Kings, whose messenger and son, Jesus Christ, said, "Love your enemies?" He may have fulfilled duties imposed on him by his position, but that position is one of his own choice, long sought after, and earnestly and tenaciously held. For the acts which it imposes on him he is, in consequence, wholly responsible. Here, then, is a minister of Christ making himself a party to a proceeding which is a practical contradiction to one of the most important and explicit commands of his Master. Such is one, and a very lamentable, consequence of the union of Church and State. Political piety, coming from political religion, has never yet failed, and never will fail to be corrupt. But, in truth, the writer of this song of triumph would appear to have found pleasure in the performance of his task. The whole tone of the composition discloses a mind in harmony with the occasion. The organ would not, indeed, have swelled into a full chorus of gratulation and praise, had not the hand of the great mistress touched the keys. But the instrument appears to have been quite ready, waiting only those delicate yet potent fingers; on whose approach its "sleeping music" pealed forth in strains both full and glad. Anglican episcopacy, then, is, in full, answerable for this prayer of thanksgiving, which, as we have seen, asks of God the very opposites of what Christ approved and enjoined. The objection involved in these facts is fundamental. Whatever the form of supplication may contain, it cannot, if it approve of war, be acceptable to the enlightened and faithful disciple of Christ. All thanksgivings for victory are bad. They all imply some approval of slaughtering enemies. In consequence, they are so far not only un-Christian but anti-Christian. The Gospel must be constructed anew, or such practices must be given up.

But, to my mind, these triumphal odes in devotional prose, wear too much the character of impiety. God is thanked for the victory. He in consequence fought the battle. From Him the skill to plan, and the force to execute the murderous undertaking. This is what every prayer of the kind declares, directly or by implication. Now, what right have we to make these assumptions? What right have we to claim the special aid of Heaven? What do we by this but impute our plans and our enterprises to the universal Father? Is it pious or impious to make every thrust be carried home by His mighty hand? — every volley bearing torture and death, be guided by His finger? View the scene a little nearer. Mark the passions which rage on both sides, and on every hand.

Is this what Christ meant when He said, "Love your enemies?" And when these passions have once sunk to rest, the rage died away, the fury exhausted, the ill-will calmed to indifference — then pass over that field of battle, mark the gore, the blood, the severed or shattered limbs, the dying and the dead? hear the low moaning of the worn sufferer, and the shrieks of the tortured one; see the weeping and half distracted mother seeking her only son in this wide slaughter-house of human beings; and tell me, I pray, are you, in sight and hearing of these things, prepared to ascribe them to the special act of God? Yet this you do, when you thank him for giving you victory over your foes.

Still further, such a proceeding is an undue and unwarranted assumption of being in the right. It takes for granted the very thing to be proved. It takes this for granted at the bar of God, the Judge of all. It anticipates his sentence, and takes care to make that sentence a favorable one. In its very nature it is a pharisaical proceeding. The pharisee thanked God that he was not as other men, and then went on to recount his own righteous deeds. After such a model does the prayer now before us, tell of the blessings of peace enjoyed under the direction of the British Crown; declare that the war had not been occasioned "by any injustice on our part, or apprehension of injury at our hands," and boast of the spirit of moderation and mercy in the day of success. Now, suppose that these were admitted facts, are they facts which ought to enter into a prayer? Are our prayers to be made occasions of self-glorification? The Saviour has given us a model in the prayer that bears His sacred name. Is there in that any recital or the slightest mention of human merits? On the contrary, the Saviour gave this command, "When ye shall have done all these things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants." (Luke xvii. 10.) Well, however, may those who have done the reverse of what Jesus commanded in respect of enemies, do the reverse also of what he enjoined in regard to prayer. One misdeed necessitates another.

But the truth of these self-praisings may be questioned. The enemy, it is said, had nothing to fear. Nothing to fear from a power which, being a stranger to the soil, has gone on from intrigue to victory, from victory to intrigue; now assailing, now protecting, now embroiling, now tranquillising, but always gaining territory; becoming more formidable, if not also more ambitious! I say that every independent chief in India has everything to fear from British diplomacy, prowess, and love of gain.

As to the blessings of peace, alleged to have been enjoyed under the protection of the British Crown, let them be all that the composer of this prayer could wish to represent them—though to me they appear the bare possibilities of the future, rather than the substantial realities of the past; still one word here employed, betrays the hollowness of the plea. "*Protection*," which is a soft synonym for servitude; protection, which is never accepted unless by the politically weak, or the personally degraded; pro-

tection, when looked closely into, means that the English hold their power in India by the right of conquest, and that as conquerors they govern the country. Now, then, I say, that viewing such a state of things in the light of the war system, the Sikhs were justified in rising against their protectors, that is, their conquerors, and vindicating their liberty and independence. Let us do unto others as we would be done by. Let us suppose the case our own. The Sikhs are the protectors, the British the protected. Would not the hand that sundered the unworthy bond be blessed by a thousand lips, and lauded in ten thousand churches? How then can we impute to an enemy, that, as a crime, which in a fellow citizen we should extol as a merit? and how can we presume to do so in the Court of Heaven? Still worse is the claim to "moderation and mercy in the day of success." I do not intend to intimate that our soldiers did anything beyond the ordinary cruelty of war; but I do mean to say, that they did that which should have caused all claim to the exercise of moderation and mercy to be left out at least in a prayer. The act to which I allude, I consider so horrible, that I will not attempt to describe it in my own words. It has been thus set forth:

Notwithstanding all these accumulated defences, and the obstinate resistance of the Sikhs, the courage of the British troops overcame every obstacle; and the enemy, after suffering severely from the fire of musketry and artillery, were eventually driven by the bayonet and the sabre (for even the British cavalry made their way into the works) in a dense and disorderly mass, upon the bridge, and into the river in their rear. Then commenced one of the most fearful scenes of slaughter that has been witnessed in modern warfare. The bridge of boats, far too small, if it had remained perfect, to admit the mass of fugitives crowding upon it, was partially broken down or sunk by their weight, and the river, having been suddenly swelled by rain, was hardly, if at all, fordable. Thousands of men were therefore struggling in water beyond their depth, exposed to the close and murderous fire poured upon them from the British musketry and artillery. As the Sikhs, on that and previous occasions, had shown no mercy to their opponents,—cruelly butchering the wounded who fell near their ranks,—no mercy was shown to them by the exasperated soldiers; and their loss, by the storm of shot poured upon them, and by the waters of the Sutlej, was so enormous, as to produce a total disorganization of their army, and to render the idea of resisting the subsequent operations of the British army altogether hopeless.—*Manchester Guardian, April* 4th, 1846.

Now, granting that this wholesale slaughter was required by policy, was it right, was it becoming, to proclaim our "moderation" before the throne of Almighty God? The carnage may have been necessary, but no one will say that it partook of moderation or mercy. I here appeal to those who do not object to war, and I ask them if they can justify the terms by which the conduct of our troops in the moment of certain victory, is characterized in the Archbishop's prayer?

That prayer is no less un-English than it is un-Christian. It is the attribute of an Englishman to succor and raise a fallen

enemy. This form of thanksgiving is in truth a bill of indictment. The Archbishop here appears like Satan of old against Job, as the Attorney-General, retained and pleading in the Court of Heaven for the condemnation of the Sikhs. Not content with beating and slaughtering them on earth, we here labor to procure a verdict against them at the bar of God. The priest follows up the rout caused by our Generals; and, encountering the foe after his last death struggle, meets him in the other world with a bill of pains and penalties. What are its allegations? The Sikhs are barbarous invaders — lawless aggressors, having ambitious designs. Well! these are bad qualities. Let us look at each separately. The Sikhs are barbarous. As such, they are rather to be pitied than punished. It is bad enough to be barbarous, without being hung, beaten, and destroyed. And if barbarism is a bad thing, those who call themselves Christians should aim to cure it. Is war an appropriate remedy? Are the Sikhs less barbarous now that they have been vanquished? It is possible to brutalize barbarians, and for this miserable end I know not a more efficacious means than war.

But has this allegation more truth than others which we have examined? I have no hesitation in pronouncing it an exaggeration. I will translate a few words explanatory of their condition prior to the spread of the British power in India: "The Sikhs belong to the family of Hindoos. In religion they have separated themselves from the population of the countries about the Ganges. They profess a peculiar faith, which a Hindoo priest, by name Nanik, founded in the commencement of the 15th century. Nanik preached a pure theism and universal toleration. He maintained that the image worship of Hindostan had led men away from the service of the true God. The worship of God he held to be man's chief duty, the form to be altogether a matter of indifference. This belief in God and in future retribution was the root of his system. Very simple prayers constituted public worship: his chief commands were never to strive about dogmas, to bathe often, and to abstain from the flesh of swine."* Such in its essence is the religion of the Sikhs. It is true they have more or less departed from its injunctions, and neglected its spirit; but if such unfaithfulness suffices to sustain the imputation of being barbarians, there are professed Christians — ay, even on the bench of bishops — who would do well to change either their conduct or their name. At any rate, the religious principles of the Sikh reformer may read a useful lesson to such as have neither simple prayers nor a tolerant Creed.

But the enemy is an ambitious invader If so, let him be condemned on earth, and prayed *for*, not *against*, before the Throne of Grace. And let not condemnation proceed from the lips of a British legislator; for what but ambition gained our Indian empire, and what but invaders are we on Indian soil?

---

* Ergänzungsblätter. No. 36, p. 563.

"Aggressors!" *we* are the aggressors. The first as well as the last blow came from a British hand. The fact bears stating in a very different way. The Archbishop has made his speech against the accused. Could the dead speak in self defence, would they not plead that it was the sword of liberty which they drew — the sword of national emancipation and independence? Would they not declare that it was in fighting for their country against ambitious, if not lawless, aggressors, that they had lost their lives? The verdict in this issue of the Great Judge of Heaven and Earth, I will not presume to anticipate. But in view of what has now been said, I must declare that this triumphal and accusatory prayer offends against common justice and common sense, as much as it does against good feeling, and the spirit and precepts of the Gospel. But while I leave the arraignment of the Sikhs before that high court into which political piety has ventured to carry it, one great truth I must declare — a truth which, whether high or low, Briton or Hindoo, we should never forget, namely, that God's ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts; that it is with an equal eye, as Lord of all, he looks down on Brahmin and Bishop, Sikh and Queen, Barbarian, Scythian, Bond and Free; that he loves each and all alike; that the Thames in his eyes is no more precious than the Ganges; that an invader of a century old is as much an invader as one of yesterday; and that he knows no difference, is no respecter of persons, unless so far as one man or one nation is more than another enlightened, tolerant, merciful, forgiving, just, beneficent, of a lowly mind, and of a meek and quiet spirit

---

FUTURE LIFE.

Is there any need of a stronger light on the subject of our future existence, than that given to us by one of our own race, having died and risen again from His grave, and who, after His sleep, had exhibited Himself in the dark tabernacle of mankind as identically the same, with precisely the same disposition, the same friendship—bearing in his faithful memory the smallest as well as the greatest events of His earthly existence? What a clear, what a cheering light, has not this kindled around the dark gates of the tomb! It has united the two worlds; it has thrown a bridge over the dark abyss. It enables the otherwise timorous pilgrim to approach it without horror, and friends to say "Good Night" to each other with the same composure, on the evening of life, as on the evening of a day.—*F. Reimer.*

THE

UNITARIAN.

[From the Christian Reformer, London, June, 1846.]

THE PRESENT POSITION OF UNITARIANS, AND "THE RELIGIOUS WORLD."

We live in an age of great religious excitement. The period of a dull indifference has passed away, and all men are now inquiring, What is truth? or, Which is the true Church? This has produced increase of liberality in some, and increase of bigotry in others:—of liberality in statesmen, in men taking wide and comprehensive views of society, its wants, its capabilities and its tendencies; as is evidenced in the passing of the Dissenter's Chapels Bill, and the Bill for the increased grant to Maynooth College:—of bigotry in those who imagine that religious truth has but one outward form, that the deep inward sentiment must be embodied in one only set of dogmas, and that their form, their dogmas, are they only which can be genuine, and that all others are infallibly false, heretical and damnable. But the very upholders of this narrow notion, so incompatible with the nature and history of the human mind, are themselves furnishing the proofs of its unsoundness; for they divide into parties, jealous, violent and bitter; and only unite their forces when they think they can run down a "Socinian," or prevent some act of grace towards "idolatrous Papists," as some of them, at least,

call the believers in an ancient faith, that, if tradition could claim our reverence, is far more worthy of our homage than an eclectic creed, pretending only to lean upon tradition, or to admit nothing that hath not the certain warrant of Holy Scripture.

The religious elements of society are in a great ferment, not only in England, but on the continent of Europe and in America. By the great mass of orthodox Protestantism, Unitarianism is regarded with a hatred that would be satisfied with nothing short of its complete annihilation, and is denounced with a proportionate virulence. But we stand unmoved from our place. We utter no voice of dread. We show no indications of terror. We make no preparations for deserting our standard; but, with erect mien, with hopeful eyes, with a calm expression of trust in our countenance, we appear as if a charmed circle were around us, within which our opponents cannot come, and into which they cannot reach to harm us. Nay, if any one from those who stand around comes within that circle, it is to defend our outward and social rights, or our inward and individual liberties. And, so long as we present our face to the world, our charmed circle will remain, around which superstition will jabber, and theological hatred gnash its teeth in vain; not until we turn our backs and prepare for flight will the foe rush in; and then they will crush us at our very altars.

How is it that we, a small, firm, but not too closely united band, not only maintain our ground, but exercise much influence, and bring to our rescue, when threatened to be oppressed by unjust laws, the zeal of the statesman and the calm learning of the lawyer? It is not affirmed that we, but that the principles which we maintain, are the salt of the earth, which cannot be trodden under foot of men until it have lost its saltness. It is not affirmed that we, but that the principles which we maintain, are the light of the world, which there is no bushel of bigotry large enough to hide, and which there

must be no bed of sloth to smother, with its curtained, downy dreams of "Great is truth and will prevail," while we slumber on in careless forgetfulness, or criminal indifference to the stewardship committed to our trust. The salt must yet savour the whole earth — the light must yet shine to all that are in the house. And it is because of this necessity that we stand calm and fearless amid the commotions which stir the religious world, at present, to its very depths. We are so maintained in our position for high and holy purposes. Or if, from our unworthiness, we be not, we are maintained until other instruments shall be ready to carry on, with greater zeal, vigor and success, the work of God. This latter view often forces itself upon the mind when we encounter apathy, witness and are chilled by cold indifference, or are tempted to yield to the pressure of adverse circumstances. It is sometimes strongly impressed upon our thoughts that, as the Israelites of old were made the depositaries of the truth until the nations were ripe for change, prepared to receive the glorious gospel of the blessed God, so we are made the depositaries of those true principles of liberty, those few, simple, scriptural doctrines which compose our creed, and of that glorious teaching concerning the infinite and eternal love of the Father, which, with impious folly, the world brands as heretical, only till other men shall come, with heartier shouts of "Hosanna! Glory to God in the highest!"— and shall carry those principles, doctrines and teaching forward, with a nobler song of trust and confidence to a surer triumph! God grant it may not be so; but that we may reap the harvest that we have sowed, that we may carry home our sheaves rejoicing, and may lay up the wheat, with humble gladness and thankfulness, in our Heavenly Father's garner.

In order to see our position truly, we must look out of ourselves, of our denominational interests, even of the holy principles which we cherish as the life-blood of

genuine Christianity. We must inquire how the present zealous, excited, divided, antagonistic state of religious parties has arisen. Its history traces from towards the middle of the last century, and it has gone on increasing, changing, deepening, unto the present day.

The religious parties, at and after the Reformation in this country, formed as much by the operation of political as of religious causes, when the fierce strife was over, and especially when, at the Revolution, the country sunk down into internal peace under William and Mary, scarcely broken by the attempts of the exiled family to regain the throne — these religious parties, when they had composed themselves in their respective places, upon such national ecclesiastical revenues, or private endowments, or annual subscriptions, as their several circumstances gave them, gradually sunk from outward peace to inward dulness and inactivity, from the subdued rancor of religious warfare to apathy and indifference, from a remitted watchfulness, that once had challenged, as a sentinel, every passer-by, to a slumbering upon their posts : they not only cultivated the vineyard less diligently, but seemed ready to leave not only the care of the seasons to Divine Providence, but that labor also which is man's appointed share in all the great works done upon the face of the earth, which have human advancement and happiness for their object.

Then came the age of huge folios, of curious disquisitions in theology, religion and morals, which satisfied the zeal of learned men, who felt that they, at least, were worthily discharging the duties of their sacred office, and bearing their testimony against error and iniquity : but it was also the age of pleasure-loving and pleasure-seeking priests, sleek men of the world, who did duty for a living, or rather neglected it for the fox-chase and the deep potations which succeeded — for the ball-room when young, and for the card-table when idle luxury had made strong exertion distasteful, or the advance of years had rendered cupidity a stronger motive than

mingling of hands, the gains of fortune more tempting than the flatteries and smiles of gallantry. A deep sleep seemed to overpower the Church universal, pervading Episcopalians and Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists alike; or, if any were awake and earnest, they saw not the direction in which their labors would be of the greatest avail, but were directing their aims against each other, instead of against that vast mass of ignorance, sin, corruption and impiety, which lay sweltering and festering around them.

But it could not remain thus forever. The spirit of the gospel is too vital always to be subdued beneath a worldly spirit, on the one hand, and a spirit of learned self-complacency, on the other. Methodism sprung up in the very bosom of England — in Oxford, at once the seat of its learning and the centre of its profligacy. It sent forth a light which flashed from one end of England to the other, roused apathy at first to opposition and then to emulation, created the Evangelical party in the Established Church, stirred up to renewed and better-directed exertions the orthodox Dissenters, extended its own borders and numbers, until it became too mighty to remain an irregular and unacknowledged off-shoot of the Church of England, and, denied admittance there, made its Conference, in all respects, an independent sovereign power, wielding a wide sway and a wider influence, and animated the friends of rational religion, Presbyterians and General Baptists, to a well-fought contest for Scriptural truth and Christian liberty.

The great principle embodied in Methodism is, that religion is a vital, personal and practical concern — a matter not so much of abstract truth as of conversion to God, redemption from the sins, follies and impieties of the world to a life in God, in Christ, in heaven begun on earth — to a life of love reaching upwards to the Eternal, and downward to the lowliest of his creatures — of love which banishes all doubt, all fear, all impurity of heart and all iniquity of life, which is one con-

stant feeling, borne in, impressed upon the mind, filling it with unspeakable joy, of entire union with the Father, and with Jesus Christ, his only-begotten Son.

It is easily seen how such a view of the gospel, up to a certain point perfectly in agreement with sound reason and rightly-interpreted Scripture, in the hands of such a man as John Wesley, should shake old apathy to its very centre, warm and invigorate the religious principle in innumerable hearts, and even where it did not convince of ecclesiastical or theological errors, of wrong modes of acting or thinking, should give a true direction to the noble zeal and emulation which it aroused, should point men to the victims of gross darkness, foul lusts, and impious rebellion against God, as those lost ones whom Christ came into the world to seek and to save.

Such was Methodism in its best days, while it was establishing itself, while it was reforming the clergy of the Episcopal Church, while it was guiding to its true aim the renovated zeal of the old bodies of Dissenters. But the principle that religion is a vital, personal and practical concern, leads necessarily to the doctrine of free inquiry, of individual examination of the Scriptures, their genuineness and authenticity, of the comparative indifference of outward forms and ecclesiastical government, so that the gospel be preached : and there was a time when the Evangelical party in the Church were almost ready to unite in an endeavor to free the Establishment from the bondage of the State and of lay, unevangelical patronage, and to place her in a condition to undertake the large and searching reformations which they deemed she needed. Again, the principle that religion is a vital, personal and practical concern, leads also, by easy, upward steps, to an individual and rational interpretation of the Scriptures, to the casting aside of tradition, authority, common consent of all Christians in all ages, and any other extra-scriptural supports of commonly-received doctrines, until there must be a safe landing in liberal theology, far from Athanasian Creeds, Assembly Catechisms, or John Wesley's Sermons.

The High-Church party took alarm at this double tendency of Evangelical principle, and the stronger-minded, clearer-headed, more learned and more bold among them trod their way back firmly, decidedly, and with large strides towards the traditions of the first four centuries of the Christian Era, and now sympathize with Rome far more than with Geneva, stigmatize the Reformation as a great evil, contend for the independent existence of the English Church, and desire to be known as Anglo-Catholics, or the English portion of the Universal Church. It is a strong position which they have taken, the only position which is tenable, short of unlimited individual inquiry and responsibility, — a position which they can make good against all who set up "the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel" as a bar against freedom, but a position which they must hold by and for themselves — the multitude have, and can have, no sympathy with them. These Tractarian leaders — nothing need be said of the motley tribes of aspirants to priestly authority who babble in their train — these Tractarian leaders have spoken out too plainly, too forcibly, too candidly, of what the Scriptures do teach, and of what they do not teach, unless they be interpreted by tradition, not to alarm the Evangelical portion of the clergy of the Established Church, who, for the most part, have lately held back from intercourse with Dissenters, and have become more loud than ever in their denunciation of rational theology, in order to show that their principle of the individuality of religious faith and practice does not lead to Socinianism. Their outcry is echoed back by orthodox Dissenters, angry at being deserted by their former allies and "dear friends," and at the imputation cast upon them that their voluntaryism, their independency, their doctrine of a purely personal conversion, acceptance and justification, leads by ever quickening steps, if duly followed out, to the much-dreaded regions of Heterodoxy.

We see, then, how it is that High-Church and Low-

Church, Episcopalian and Dissenter, are more divided than ever against each other, are full of contention and bitterness, are struggling for the ascendancy in all directions, and each and all direct the envenomed arrows of their odium theologicum against our small, but we trust, firm band. The Tractarians boldly say — "Not Scripture alone, but Scripture and Tradition!" The others, equally resolved to maintain "the peculiar doctrines," contend indeed for the Scriptures as the only rule of faith, but say that they must be interpreted by the Holy Spirit; that is, that men are perverse and carnal reasoners if they do not come to sound orthodox conclusions.

Thus, then, Methodism gave the modern impulse to individual religion — Tractarianism sees clearly its natural and necessary tendency; and when the latter shows to the former the upward bearing of its path, do we wonder or complain that it should not at once be able to bear the light? Having had its eyes bandaged by mystery, when the bandage is removed by a hostile hand, on purpose that it may be dazzled by the glowing sun, do we express astonishment that it should persist in shutting its eyes, and prefer, at present, to grope on in darkness? We are only in the crisis of a great change, and no crisis is pleasant, especially for those who stand between opposing forces, and seem to be, if they are not truly so, the main cause of their angry disputation and fierce opposition. When, under such circumstances, we are smitten on the one cheek, without turning the other, we must expect to be smitten on that also. But patience — let patience have her perfect work. Let us have courage, trust, charity, and all will be well — if not in our time, in the time of those who shall succeed us. Our part is to stand firm in the day of tribulation. "Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand." Our position is, still to maintain the standard of free inquiry, to defend it against all assaults, to prevent it from being mutilated

by false friends, to invite, to persuade men to it, and to warn them against trooping after merely sectarian banners, with the narrow restrictions, the unchristian jealousies, and the unholy fears by which they are ever accompanied—to show that our freedom is not freedom from the law of Christ, from the demands of duty, from the requirements of conscience, from the loveliness of that charity which is so beautifully and affectingly described by the apostle Paul; but that it leads directly to the feet of our Divine Master, into whatever path is straight before our steps, to that active, earnest, practical love which finds objects for its exercise in all the true and varied interests of humanity.

[From the Unitarian, (London) June, 1846]

THOUGHTS ON THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

"Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions."—*Ecclesiastes*, vii. 29.

It is not uncommon to hear these words quoted, as though they afforded some countenance to that lamentable corruption of Christian doctrine, which has received the name of Original or Birth Sin. As the fair inference appears to me to be precisely the reverse, a few remarks on them may be a suitable introduction to what is further to be offered on this subject.

I observe, therefore, that when it is said, "God made *man* upright," it is not any particular individual man that is spoken of; least of all our first progenitor Adam, whose name is not mentioned, either here or in any part of this book—but the human race, or human nature in general. This will be obvious when we consider the connection, "God hath made man or mankind upright, but *they* have sought out many inventions." It is not the sin of Adam, or of any other individual, which is said to have introduced universal corruption in place of the original purity and uprightness of human nature, and thus defeated the wise purpose and design of the beneficent Creator. On the contrary, as to his frame and constitution, every human being is what his Maker intended him to be. God has formed him up-

right, or rather (as the word might be more exactly translated), formed him *right*. The whole frame of human nature, such as we find it in ourselves and our fellow-creatures around us—the constitution both of body and of mind, with which we are endowed, liable though the one may be to disease and death, and the other to error, temptation and sin, bears no marks of the wrath of Him who made it, but, on the contrary, exhibits the proofs of His wisdom and parental kindness. Man is in truth the creature of God. He is fearfully and wonderfully made, and in all respects admirably adapted to the situation in which he is placed, considered as a scene of trial, probation, and discipline, which is intended to fit and prepare him for a future immortal state.

And here I am desirous to observe in the outset, that in using these expressions, I would be understood as speaking not of Adam, or of any peculiar nature or faculty which he is supposed to have possessed, but of *men* as they now exist—of that constitution of which we are conscious in ourselves, which renders us rational and moral beings; fit subjects of that moral government which our heavenly Father exercises over those whom he calls not merely His creatures but His children, in virtue of which they are even said to be created in his image. For in such terms do we find the sacred writers speaking, not merely of Adam, but of all his descendants after him. It is true, these latter are often spoken of as a lost and abandoned race; *fallen* man is said to be degraded from his first estate, depraved and corrupted to the very core, altogether born in sins. Such language as this, however, is used, not in Scripture, which alone could authorize its employment by us, but only in catechisms and creeds, the compositions of fallible men. In short, I see no ground, either from Scripture or from our experience of the actual condition of man, to suppose that in natural capacity for knowledge, righteousness, and holiness, he is now, or ever has been, inferior to his first progenitor.

Nevertheless, man has fallen; he has sinned;—all men have sinned, and come far short of their duty. This unhappily admits of no dispute; and it becomes every one, in meditating upon man's liability to sin, as evinced in his own multiplied failings and transgressions, to humble himself before God in a deep feeling of his own unworthiness; not to cast the blame upon his Maker, as though he had been framed with an especial leaning and propensity to sin; but to refer his offences to their true cause in *his own* abuse and neglect of opportunities, in his own uncontrolled or unsubdued passions, in "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life." * "Let no man,"

* I. John, ii. 16.

says another apostle, "when he is tempted, say, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man, but every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lusts and enticed." *

It has been justly remarked, and the saying well deserves our attention on many accounts, that the mere fact of man's liability to sin is so far from being in itself a mark of God's displeasure, either against ourselves or against the first transgressor, that it results from, and seems in the present state of things to be a necessary consequence of, his bounty and great goodness to his rational creatures. † For, first, what *is* sin? The apostle John defines it, "a transgression of the law." But a law, properly speaking, is a rule of action prescribed to a rational and intelligent being, of which he is able to perceive the propriety, and acknowledge the obligation. If there were no law, there could be no transgression; as St. Paul says, ‡ "sin is not imputed where there is no law;" and again, § "the strength of sin is the law." In this respect, therefore, it is undoubtedly true, that man was and is liable to sin, not in consequence of any *fall* or degradation of his nature, but as the result of his high powers, and the eminent intellectual and moral faculties with which he has been endowed by his Maker. Brutes cannot sin; but is this any mark of excellence or superiority in their nature? By no means; it is because they are not furnished with faculties which enables them to receive a law, to discern its wise adaptation to their own wants and circumstances, to acknowledge the superior authority of the source from which it proceeds, and their own consequent obligation to observe and obey it.

Again, all the principles of our nature which expose us to temptation are in fact essential and indispensable parts of our constitution. They are not *corruptions* of our nature, but desirable endowments with which it has been furnished and adorned by its Author — not in His wrath and sore displeasure, but out of the overflowing of His great love and kindness to the children of men. Thus our *bodily senses*, which enable us to discern and admire the works of creation, to acquire the materials upon which the powers of the mind are afterwards to be employed, and without which they could not be called into exercise and cultivation at all—what are these, but inlets to temptation? Our eyes enable us to see many desirable objects; among the rest, many things which cannot be obtained without transgressing the laws of God and committing sin. Our eyes thus bring

---

* James i. 13, 14.

† See "Last Thoughts on Various Important Subjects," by Noah Worcester, D. D., p. 15.

‡ Romans, v. 13 § 1 Corinthians, xv. 56.

temptation in our way, and may be the instruments by which we are seduced into the paths of sin; but shall we therefore contend that our being able to see is a proof that our natures are corrupt and depraved? In like manner, our *appetites* are useful and necessary parts of our constitution, the occasions of much immediate pleasure, and as such, a mark of God's bounty and kindness in making a provision for our comfortable passage through this world. When kept in due subordination, and taken into connection with other more elevated principles of our nature, which they often excite and call into action, they are the means of enlarging our powers, of gradually preparing us for more refined and valuable enjoyments, and a more spiritual state of existence. Without them, man could not have been what he is; nor would he have been adapted for the place he now holds in the scale of God's creation. But it is evident that they also often lead him astray. They are apt to engross to themselves an excessive share of our attention; at the same time that they excite us to diligence and activity in order to acquire the means of their gratification, and thus call the powers of the mind into exercise and improvement, they too often prevent these powers from being directed to other pursuits more excellent and truly worthy of them. They often tend to exclude more elevated pursuits, and the instruments of more substantial and durable happiness. In our eagerness after the inferior pleasures they set before us, we are tempted to violate or neglect the laws of God, when these require from us a course of conduct which involves restraint and self-denial. But shall we therefore say that it would have been better for us, if we had not been furnished with these principles at all, and by consequence had been incapable of deriving pleasure from the various objects which make impressions on our senses?

Our *rational nature* is so constituted as to enable us to take a lively interest in many pursuits on which a rational being alone is competent to enter, and which afford us many valuable sources of happiness and improvement. Thus, in consequence of the various advantages we derive from the possession of knowledge, we learn to take pleasure in its pursuit and acquisition for its own sake; and that principle of *curiosity* which is characteristic of our natures, and the more remarkably so in proportion as our powers are cultivated and improved by education, is gradually formed in every man's mind. No one, I am persuaded, who has ever felt this desire, or who has experienced the pleasures which flow from its gratification, can seriously think it would have been better for man to have been without it; or will hesitate to acknowledge it as a most signal proof of our Maker's care and bounty to us his favored creatures, that he has herein made us but a little lower than the

angels, — that he has empowered us to engage in employments which enable us to know ourselves, to discern his image in his glorious works, and "look through nature up to nature's God." And yet it is manifest, that this very principle is the source of many and great temptations to sin. The admiration which is bestowed on those who are looked up to as philosophers and wise men after the flesh, and the influence which they are permitted to exercise over those who acknowledge their superiority in these respects, occasion no small portion of jealousy, rivalship, and animosity among such as aspire after distinction in this way, and too commonly lead them to seek after their chief happiness in a regard for the praise of men. It has been frequently observed, that men of learning and extensive knowledge have often appeared not more remarkable for their eminent and valuable attainments, than for the vainglory and conceit which attend them. And this same principle of curiosity is still more frequently found in a lower sphere to lead to abuses not less lamentable. But we do not on that account seek to root it out altogether from our minds; or wish it had never been there, merely because we should not then have been exposed to some temptations which now occasionally betray us into sin.

The same general remark will apply to other desires which appear to prevail more or less wherever men are found, and which may therefore be thought to be essentially connected with, and to arise out of, a rational and intelligent nature. Such are the desire of esteem, the desire of power, the love of eminence and distinction. These are continually urging men on to active exertion, and enter largely into the motives which stimulate to the most honorable labors and the noblest sacrifices. They are not, it must be confessed, the most elevated principles of action of which our nature is capable; though it may be doubted whether those minds which are in a great measure insensible to their influence, at least in the earlier stages of their growth, ever make any considerable progress in intellectual and moral improvement. But these principles may be abused and perverted. They may betray an ill-regulated mind into the follies of pride, vanity, and self-conceit; — into that inordinate ambition which scruples no means to acquire power, and hesitates not to use it when acquired for base, selfish, and unworthy ends. Here, therefore, it again appears that the characteristics or principles of our nature which render us liable to sin by exposing us to additional and peculiar temptations, from which we should otherwise be free, are not proofs of our Maker's wrath and displeasure; nor do they indicate, as some would have us believe, a *disjointed, fallen, ruined* nature. On the contrary, they are essential parts of the constitution with which our heavenly Father has endowed us in his love and gracious kindness; — they are destined, and well

adapted by Divine wisdom to be the instruments of present happiness and of moral improvement, leading the way to higher attainments, to greater and more substantial happiness hereafter.

The same may be said of the *affections*; — of gratitude, friendship, patriotism; — of parental attachment, of filial love. If any principles or sentiments can be said to be truly characteristic of human nature in its present state, surely these are they; and it will hardly be maintained by any, that it would have been better if we had been without them, or if they had been weaker, and less influential than they commonly are. On the contrary, it will be admitted, if I mistake not, on all hands, that these affections are the source of a large portion of the purest happiness of which we are capable in this mortal state; — and not only so, but that they furnish the *elements*, if I may so call them, of our religious and moral education, by which this world is peculiarly fitted to supply a discipline which shall prepare us for a more advanced and elevated state of existence. They supply us with many of our worthiest and most powerful motives to action; — they tend to draw us out of ourselves, teaching us to mind not our own things merely, but the things of others, to weep with them that weep, to rejoice with them that rejoice, and to take a deep and lively interest in whatever contributes to the improvement and happiness of our brethren of mankind. It is therefore undeniable, that that original formation of our natures which made our souls susceptible of these feelings, and that constitution of human society which has established us in various social relations with our fellow-creatures, and has thus led to the development and cultivation of these affections, are among the best and most valuable gifts of a kind Providence. We should not infer from hence, that human nature is a *ruin*, but rather that it is a fair and lovely temple, erected under the auspices of Divine wisdom, destined to be sanctified and honored by being devoted to the worship and service of its Great Founder, and to receive continually more and more glorious embellishments from his adorning hand. And yet it is equally undeniable, that every one of these excellent and valuable gifts may be, and often is, the occasion and instrument of sin,—the inlet of new and strong and various temptations, to which we should not otherwise have been liable. The tender ties of family affection may blind us to the imperfections of their objects, and lead us so far to concentrate all our thoughts, and exertions, and labors, for the single purpose of promoting their interests, as to neglect what is due to still higher and more important objects. Friendship, instead of being directed to those who really deserve our esteem, or are likely to be of essential service to us by the possession of val-

uable qualities and endowments, or by furnishing useful advice and assistance in important pursuits, or by setting an edifying example of piety and virtue, inciting us to follow in their steps, may be so perverted as to become one of our most fatal and dangerous snares. Under the name and guise of friendship, we may be misled by those evil communications which corrupt good manners. The evil enticements and seductions of sinners, set off and adorned as they often are by qualities in themselves fitted to attract our esteem and admiration, may carry us far away from the path which leadeth unto life. The very desire of promoting the prosperity of our friends, may often tempt us to resort to means for this purpose utterly inconsistent with other and higher duties. Perverted patriotism has but too often led the way to the blackest sins and deepest woes that have ever afflicted the world and degraded human nature.

It would be easy to follow out this general observation further, in its application to a greater variety of examples; and I apprehend we should find, that in examining the sources and occasions of sin, when we ask the question, What is it that renders man *liable* to sin? we might almost always put the question in this form—What is it that renders man *capable* of sinning? In short, we should find that in every case the causes of transgression are the perversion or corruption of those very principles which are the true glory of our frame,—which are essential to the happiness, almost to the existence of society among men,—which are required in order to render this life what it was evidently intended to become, a school of moral and religious education, where, as children and pupils in this earliest stage of our rational existence, we are gradually trained to a fitness for a more enduring and exalted state.

That men sin, therefore, is no proof that their natures are utterly depraved and degraded; or that they are fallen from the state in which our first parents were created,—or that in consequence of Adam's first transgression, it has pleased our Maker to frame all his posterity with souls radically corrupt, and naturally incapable of doing a good action, or harboring a single thought that is not essentially sinful, and deserving of God's wrath and curse for ever. However frequent such revolting expressions as these may be in the creeds and theological systems of men, we shall look for them in vain, or for anything like them, in Holy Writ. Thus we are assured in our text, that whatever any man may have made himself, God made him *right*. He has endowed him with no principles which are in their own nature, and essentially, corrupt; — the human frame and constitution is throughout a masterpiece of Divine workmanship, admirably adapted to the condition of man in his present state, and necessary to the purposes of his being. Nevertheless, it ap-

pears that all these principles, not excepting the most elevated, important, and indispensable, may in certain circumstances become the occasions of sin; — they lay us open to additional and peculiar temptations; and consequently, at the same time that they increase our powers and add to our enjoyments, and serve to raise us to a higher dignity and excellence in the scale of created existence, they make fresh calls upon us for watchfulness and self-control. They require continued attention and diligence, with fervent prayer to God to guard us from their abuse and misapplication. While we justly bless and praise our Maker for his great goodness in having thus created us in his own image, we should combine with our thankfulness a continual seeking for the grace of God to direct us in the right use of our powers.

The view which we have now taken of sin, as arising not from any thing originally corrupt in our nature, but from our own perversion and misapplication of that which God made right and adapted to the best and most excellent purposes, may serve to deepen our humility and self-abasement in reflecting on our multiplied failings and transgressions. Whatever others may do, *we* cannot soothe our consciences with the pretence that as we inherited a constitution originally sinful and debased, naturally incapable of anything better, so we may be excused in yielding to the irresistible propensities of our nature, and cannot be reasonably blamed for doing only that which it was impossible for us to avoid. Our doctrine suggests no such plausible apology for sin; nor does it enable us to cast the guilt or the burden of it from ourselves, seeing that it is *we* who have sought out the many inventions and corrupt devices which have converted what God intended as the means of happiness, into instruments of degradation, sorrow, guilt and shame.

I am well aware that this is far from being a *popular* view of this subject; nor do I much wonder at it, when I consider how eager men commonly are to lay hold on everything which seems to promise an apology or excuse for their vices, or may furnish a plausible ground for throwing the blame of them in any quarter but the right one; namely, their own acquired selfishness, sordid desires, and ill-governed passions. With such men, a system which authorizes, and indeed requires them to regard the nature which God has given them as sinful to the very core, may well be popular, since it relieves them from the heavy responsibility of those vicious indulgences on which their hearts are set. "How can I," such a man will say, "be held answerable for my offences by those who allege that I was born with such a constitution of body and soul as makes me capable of nothing else but sin? How can I suppose that He whose attributes are infinite mercy and impartial justice, will require at

my hands what He has made me unable to perform, or will punish what is the inevitable result of the frame and innate principles of action with which He hath Himself endowed me? If I have no reason to suppose that I am in the number of the elect, and my unregenerate nature is therefore still essentially and radically corrupt, so that, in spite of my best endeavors, all I do and think must be only evil and that continually, why should I trouble myself about self-control and self-government? Why should I hesitate to gratify my present inclinations, and act according to the nature which it has pleased the Author of my being to give me?"

Far be it from me to insinuate that the *preachers* of this doctrine are accustomed to draw from it such practical conclusions as these. I know well that they commonly take pains to reconcile it to the dictates of what I rejoice to believe is the *natural* bias of the human mind, in favor of holiness and virtue. But I am not on that account the less persuaded, that such inferences as I have described are those which will most readily present themselves to the sinner who is anxious to find some plausible apology for persisting in his evil ways; and I must acknowledge they appear to me so decidedly the most natural and reasonable inferences, that I cannot for a moment doubt that they are in fact deduced and acted upon by many.

I cannot but rejoice in my inability to put my readers off with such "smooth preaching" as this. I cannot tempt any man to lay the flattering unction to his soul, which is fairly derived from the doctrine, that he was altogether born in sins, and is naturally capable of nothing better; that he has received from his Maker, or inherited from Adam (it matters not which, for to my mind these expressions amount to the same thing), a nature disabled from good, and wholly prone to evil. I am bound to remind him unceasingly, that God has made him *right;* by which I mean, not that he has made him holy and good—that must be his own work—but that He has so wisely constructed his frame, and inspired him with such admirable faculties and principles of action, and placed him in such circumstances tending to promote their development and due cultivation, as to leave him altogether without excuse, if he still falls away, after one or another of those many inventions which sinful men have sought out for the indulgence of their own inordinate passions and craving lusts. Without doubt we are all so placed, as to expose us to multiplied temptations; our Maker knows it, and intended it. But this is essential to the main design of the present state, which was destined to be a scene of probation and discipline for the formation and development of our moral nature. It should be a motive with us to watchfulness and prayer, that we may not be *so* led into temptation as to fall under

its evil influence. While we feel ourselves exposed to danger, we shall be excited to avail ourselves to the utmost of the opportunities and advantages which our condition supplies. We are born, it is true, into a world where sin hath entered; but it is a world into which virtue hath entered also. Are we in danger from the enticement of sinners? Let us derive support and encouragement from the bright examples of all Christian graces. Are we painfully conscious in ourselves of the weakness of human nature? Let us admire and imitate its strength, as we may often behold it displayed in a glorious and successful struggle with the powers of darkness—having derived wisdom from experience, self-possession from moral discipline, arrayed in the armor of God through faith in Him who hath overcome the world. Let us be of good cheer then, and brace up our courage for the contest. Our heavenly Father hath furnished us amply with the means, and in the word of His grace he hath given us light to direct us in our course, and encouragement to persevere unto the end.

Remember it is He that hath made you what you are, not for sin, but that you may press forward towards perfection. Strive thus to accomplish your destination, in a diligent use of the means he hath provided, and fervent prayer for guidance from above, and your labor will not be in vain in the Lord.

BIBLICAL ASTRONOMY.

The Hebrews, even in patriarchal times, were acquainted with certain of the lesser heavenly bodies. Job speaks (ix. 9) of Arcturus, Orion, and Pleiades. The heavens would naturally attract the attention of these early tenants of the earth, especially in Arabia and Palestine, the rather because, as shepherds, they passed much of their time in the open air, watching their flocks by night as well as by day. While engaged in the musings to which such a position would naturally give rise, they would, under the influence of a creative imagination, easily be led to form the stars first into groups, and then into the shapes of animals. Hence rose the signs of the zodiac. The word which, in the common version, is rendered Arcturus, means probably the Great Bear. The sons of Arcturus (Job xxxviii. 32) are the stars that accompany it, now called 'the tail of the bear.' Herder renders the words in the passage last referred to — 'Lead forth the bear with her young.' The passage speaks of the con-

stellation as conducted round and round the pole as by some unseen hand, like a mother with her children. God is made to appeal to this phenomenon as a manifestation of his majesty and power, and as far above the skill of man. Who ever looked on that beautiful constellation, and marked its regular revolutions, without feeling that its positions and movements were such as the Almighty Creator only could produce?

Orion was a constellation which was conceived of as a mighty and impious giant bound upon the sky: hence the expression, 'Canst thou loose the bands of Orion?' (Job xxxviii. 31). According to eastern tradition, this giant was Nimrod, the founder of Babylon. By the aid of a telescope, about two thousand stars have been seen in this constellation; and, in what is termed 'the sword of Orion,' there is a nebula, almost visible to the naked eye, which is computed to exceed the sun in size two trillions two hundred thousand billion times. Surely, if Job found in the starry heavens evidence for the power, providence, and majesty of God, we have incomparably greater reasons for so doing with the sublime views which astronomy has in our time laid open.

The Hebrew word rendered Pleiades, denotes *a cluster*. The name is given to the cluster of stars in the neck of the constellation Taurus, of which six or seven may be seen by the naked eye; but as many as two hundred have been counted by the aid of a telescope.

The morning star was known (Isa. xiv. 12; Rev. ii. 28). In Job xxvi. 13, is mentioned 'the crooked serpent;' the Dragon is still one of the constellations; it lies between the Great and the Little Bear, spreading itself, as it were, in windings across the heavens. The Zodiac is also mentioned in Job xxxviii. 32, under a name which signifies dwelling places or lodgings, because in them the sun appears to dwell one after another. Of the separate signs, only one is mentioned, namely, the Twins (Acts xxviii. 11), by the terms 'Castor and Pollux.' 'The chambers of the south,' in Job ix. 9, may indicate the stars hidden in the southern hemisphere, or rather in a southerly direction, in the dark recesses of the south. In Job xxxviii. 33, Jehovah asks, 'Knowest thou the ordinances of heaven?' We are apt, in the knowledge of astronomy which we now possess, to think that Job's knowledge was most insignificant, even when it was true. And, certainly our acquaintance with these 'ordinances' is sufficiently great and accurate to foster within us the most deeply felt piety; but, after all that Tycho Brahé, Kepler, Newton and others have taught, we have learnt to small purpose, if we are not convinced that what we know is, relatively to what remains to be learnt, only little more than was known to the patriarchs of old. And those who condemn the Bible, because it does not teach as much as the *Mécanique Celeste* of La Place, in effect

condemn that work itself, which, there is every reason to believe, will, in process of time, have to give place to more comprehensive as well as more exact views of the vast and immeasurable universe of God. A work which sets forth the highest truth of its age — especially if, like the Bible, it applies that truth to the great purposes of religion — will be regarded by all wisely judging men as "a pearl of great price," and "a possession for ever," notwithstanding any changes which may be brought by the constant advances of a ceaselessly progressive civilization.

About A. D. 1500, Copernicus had satisfied himself that the sun is the centre of the solar system. In 1610, Galileo, having invented a telescope, discovered Jupiter's satellites, and the moon-like phases of Venus. These discoveries supplied additional arguments for the truth of the Copernican system. This system Galileo defended in his writings, which were, on that account, condemned as heretical by the Inquisition, who, on the generally received opinion that the Scripture taught that the earth, a stationary body, was the centre of the world, accounted the new opinions to be contradicted by, and hostile to, the Bible. There thus appeared to exist a contrariety between Scripture and science. This contrariety has been met by drawing a distinction between religious and physical tenets. The former it is the object of the Bible to teach. In the case of the latter, it merely reproduces what in any period it finds prevalent. "On this point," says Professor Whewell,— "Indications of a Creator," p. 5, — "it is reasonably held that the phrases which are found in Scripture respecting astronomical facts are not to be made use of to guide our scientific opinions; they may be supposed to answer their end if they fall in with common notions, and are thus effectually subservient to the moral and religious import of revelation.

"The meaning which any generation puts upon the phrases of Scripture, depends, more than is at first supposed, upon the received philosophy of the time. Hence, while men imagine that they are contending for revelation, they are in fact contending for their own interpretation of revelation, unconsciously adapted to what they believe to be rationally probable. And the new interpretation which the new philosophy requires, and which appears to the older school to be a fatal violence done to the authority of religion, is accepted by their successors without the dangerous results which were apprehended. When the language of Scripture, invested with its new meaning, has become familiar to men, it is found that the ideas which it calls up are quite as reconcilable as the former ones were with the soundest religious views. And the world then looks back with surprise at the error of those who thought that the essence of revelation was involved in their own arbitrary version of some collateral circumstance. At the pres-

ent day, we can hardly conceive how reasonable men should have imagined that religious reflections on the stability of the earth, and the beauty of the luminaries which revolve round it, would be interfered with by its being acknowledged, that this rest and motion are apparent only." — *People's Dictionary of the Bible.*

[From the Irish Unitarian Magazine for April, 1846.]

THE JOYFUL MESSAGE.

Come to Jesus, come away:
  Let each worldly bond be burst,
Let our souls forget their clay —
  Long, too long, in bondage nurs'd.

Learn of Him the meek, the lowly,
  Who, for thee, was captive led;
And for thee, though high and holy,
  On the Cross of Calvary bled.

Learn of Him the meek and humble,
  Never from his counsels roam;
He can help you when you stumble,
  He can take the lost ones home.

Come — and He will give you pardon —
  Clothe you in His raiment bright;
He, who sorrowed in the garden,
  Welcomes to the realms of light.

Mary.

Belfast, 21*st Jan.* 1846.

[From the Unitarian, (London) July, 1836.]

NOYES'S TRANSLATIONS.

A New Translation of the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles, with Introductions and Notes, chiefly explanatory. By George R. Noyes, D. D., Hancock Professor of Hebrew, &c., and Dexter Lecturer in Harvard University. Boston: James Munroe and Co. London: Chapman, Brothers, 121 Newgate-street, 1846. pp. 290.

We rejoice at every fresh indication of renewed efforts to make the writings of the Old Testament more intelligible to the mass of mankind. Apart from the opinion that many of them are the productions of inspired men, they are the most valuable ancient documents the world possesses. There is no collection of books relating to the earlier history of our race, which will bear any comparison with them. Where shall the historian find an account of the infancy of humanity, except in those primitive works of the human mind which are contained in the Old Testament? All the monuments of Egyptian, Chaldæan, and Phœnician literature, have either entirely perished, or are left to us in such a mutilated state as to afford us but few indications of the early intellectual and moral growth of man. Committed to the Priests for preservation, we find that all the most valuable writings of these nations shared the destruction of their religious teachers, and of their temples: while many of the earliest, and most of the later literary productions of the Hebrews, have survived a course of the most violent changes in their condition, and now stand forth before the world, as the depositories of the most valuable and credible accounts of the philosophy, civilization, and general culture of the people of antiquity.

But it is not only in a historical point of view, that the literature of the Hebrews is worthy of our attention and

regard. The *Poetry* of that people, in many respects, surpasses the rich and varied compositions of the Greeks and Romans. So far as mere art is concerned, it may not bear comparison with the highest styles, that were cultivated among them; but *in substance* it is superior, not only to anything which Greece or Rome has produced, but also to every other collection of poetry that the world has known. There is a purity and serenity about it which are peculiar to it, and which have irresistible charms for all hearts in all times. There is a moral and religious atmosphere surrounding it, which is to be found in no other poetic region, and which is invigorating to man's higher nature, in whatever circumstances he is placed, as well as suited to promote his spiritual growth in every variety of condition.

Believing this to be its character, we have often regretted that our youth should be so entirely confined in their studies to reading, which is of a purely heathen complexion, while the field of Hebrew literature, containing such invaluable treasures, is never traversed by them, except for theological purposes. Let it not be said that it is not extensive or rich enough to demand attention. Those who have searched it have found there the germs of our immortal works. Milton is indebted to it for his "Paradise Lost," and "Sampson Agonistes." Raphael, Michael Angelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Corregio, the Caracci, Rubens, and Vandyke based a part of their undying fame on subjects which they found within its boundaries; while Handel and all our great musicians have derived their inspirations from the scenes which it has unfolded to their view.

Regarded only as *literary productions*, we are convinced that a more intimate acquaintance with the Hebrew writings than is generally cultivated, would have an elevating influence upon society at large. But, considered *morally and religiously*, we cannot doubt, notwithstanding all that is said to the contrary, that a more extensive knowledge of them would give a higher tone

to our morality, and a deeper fervor to our devotional spirit than those which are prevalent — a tone and a fervor in perfect accordance with the spirit of Jesus. The Law of Moses, encumbered as it is with ceremonial directions, contains principles which have led thousands on to righteousness, and are capable of leading on thousands more. The lofty strains of the Prophets have inspired unnumbered souls with glorious truths which have animated, and cheering hopes which have sustained them, and they possess the power to inspire numbers now, with like truth and hopes. The Songs of David have supported multitudes in the depths of grief and despondency; and *they are still* the well-spring from which flow many of the divine consolations that animate the drooping spirit, cheer the fainting heart, and soothe the aching head. Even the historical portions of the Old Testament are not devoid of desirable moral and spiritual influences. It would be difficult to say what a child can read with greater benefit than the early history of Samuel; how a youth can better arm himself than by studying the examples of the youthful Joseph and David; where friendship can find a greater incentive to fidelity than in the beautiful story of Ruth and Naomi; or what faith, affection, and fortitude can be more profitably emulated by our matrons and mothers, than those of the matrons and mothers of Israel.

Convinced of the truth of these remarks, we deplore the neglect into which the Old Testament has fallen, not only in our literary institutions, but among the people at large. The cause of this, in the latter case, we believe to be, *the obscurity which hangs over a considerable portion of the authorized version.* Divided into chapters and verses in the most arbitrary manner, and, in many instances anything but clearly translated, it has become, to the masses, unintelligible. They have had helps, indeed, of a certain character, for the purpose of unravelling the difficulties which meet the eye on almost every page; but it may reasonably be questioned whe-

ther those helps have not increased, instead of diminished, those difficulties. Nearly all the commentators, *whose works have been accessible to the people*, have taken different views of each really difficult passage. This has arisen from the expositors having paid too little attention to the translation of the original. Indeed, such works have been, but too frequently, undertaken by men who knew comparatively little of the Hebrew language, and who were guided more by their theological opinions, in the explanations they offered, than by sound criticism. The results of their conflicting opinions have been, that many truly devout men have despaired of arriving at any satisfactory conclusions, while infidelity has triumphed over their vain attempts to dispel the difficulties on which it had taken its stand. There has been another class of commentators, however, who have pursued their work, with profound learning and judgment, and whose chief object has been to show *what the received translation ought to be.* But the results of *their* labors have benefitted only a few; they have been considered luxuries for the studious, who could give their time to reading folios and quartos, instead of being embodied in a revised translation of the Scriptures, which would have done more to make the Sacred Writings understood and respected by the community, than all the cheap commentaries combined. This will be evident, we think, to all who have read the beautiful translations of the New Testament, by Mr. S. Sharpe, and the late Mr. Edgar Taylor. The English reader finds the majority of his difficulties removed in such translations, and is spared the annoyance, when he goes to the Scriptures in order to find nourishment for his piety, and strength for his virtuous resolutions, of having to search through pages of comment in order to find the light and help which he requires.

It has been the object of Dr. Noyes, the title of one of whose works we have placed at the head of this article, to do for the Poetical Books of the Old Testa-

ment, what the two above named gentlemen have done for all those of the New, viz., *to give a faithful representation of the literal sense of the original.* He commenced with the book of Job, which was first published in 1827, and again in 1838, in an improved form with corrections and additions to the notes. In 1831 he issued from the press his "New Translation of the Book of Psalms," which has for some time been out of print, but which, on account of its intrinsic excellence, we rejoice to hear, will soon appear in a new edition. His larger work, "A New Translation of the Hebrew Prophets, arranged in Chronological order," was published in three volumes, the first in 1833 and again in 1843, the other two in 1837. The last of the series of six volumes is now before us, and contains "A New Translation of the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles."

We have, at various times, examined the first five volumes of Dr. Noyes's works, and can say that we have never found in our language, translations of the various books they contain, which have pleased us nearly so well. His translation of Job appears a different poem to that we meet with in the authorized version, where it is worse translated than any other book. Not that he has altered its beautiful forms of expression unnecessarily, but by avoiding the abominable custom of cutting it up into verses and chapters, by giving it a poetic form, by distinctly marking the speeches of the *dramatis personæ*, and by a new translation of the most obscure passages, he has thrown a light upon the whole which adds greater lustre to its universally acknowledged excellence. The same may be said of his translation of the Psalms. Those invaluable treasuries of religious experiences, of devotional expressions, and of sublime doctrines, are made richer than ever to the English reader, by being made more faithful to the original. His larger work on the Prophets, must ever be prized by the lover of genuine poetry; and the theological in-

quirer will be grateful for so valuable a help. The arrangement of the writings in their probable chronological order will afford him much facility for the study of them, and the division of each book into distinct prophecies, instead of into chapters, will disperse much of the darkness which has so long overshadowed those beautiful portions of the Old Testament. If there is one thing we regret the absence of in this work, it is an introduction to each of the books, similar in character to those which precede the translations of Job, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles. From Dr. Noyes's pen such an addition would have been invaluable; and, although he has distinctly stated that, it is his object to limit his labors to the business of translation, we trust in future editions he will be induced to overstep the boundary he has assigned for himself, in the direction we have indicated.

When we received the last volume, we feared it would be far less interesting than the former ones. The amatory verses of the Canticles have never had many charms for us, even when considered in their true character. The Book of Ecclesiastes contains doctrines which we have not cared to recur to, after studying the more cheering ones of the Psalms and Prophets. And the Proverbs, excellent as they are, have always appeared tame after the impassioned strains of David and Isaiah. But upon a careful examination, we are led to the conclusion that we should have been deprived of a great treasure had not this volume appeared. It contains indications of the same diligence and ability having been bestowed upon it, which have characterized its predecessors. The notes are even more copious than those in the other volumes, with the exception of the first; and the meaning of many passages which were before unintelligible, has been made distinct and clear.

Besides, each of the books contained in it has its value. Dr. Noyes justly remarks, "the Book of Proverbs is, in a moral and religious point of view, one of

the most valuable portions of the Old Testament. It gives a view of the Jewish religion and morality, as pervading the common life of the Jews, much more favorable than that which we receive from the accounts of the ceremonies and forms which are elsewhere enjoined." To have this view rendered clearer by one whose researches have qualified him for the task, is a benefit, for which those who are interested in the history of Israel, cannot be too grateful. The book opens, moreover, with some of the most beautiful "moral discourses in praise of wisdom, and urging to the practice of virtue, especially the virtue of chastity;" while its doctrines, compared with those which were prevalent in the heathen world, appear to the greatest advantage.

Of Ecclesiastes our author says, "that while it may be conceded that the writer has given a more melancholy view of human life than is consistent with the spirit of Christianity or of a comprehensive philosophy, ... it may be inferred that he was a man of wisdom, virtue, and religion, according to the light which he had. He was not a fatalist, nor a skeptic, or epicurean, in any offensive sense of those terms. If he had doubts, they related to subjects upon which he had no light from the religion of his fathers and his country. If he recommended the enjoyment of life, it was such an enjoyment as was consistent with virtue and religion. A deep sense of religion was evidently habitual to him, notwithstanding the difficulties which perplexed his understanding. He has a living faith in a wise and a benevolent God, and a righteous government of the world, though the principles of this government are regarded by him as being beyond the comprehension of man." If such be a correct view of the author, and that it is we have no doubt, his work cannot be too highly prized as an evidence of our utter inability to solve the mysterious problems of our being without the aid of Christianity. As such, it may be read with profit by all classes of persons, especially

with the aid which Dr. Noyes has afforded for its full comprehension.

We shall not say much of the last book in the volume. The translator remarks upon it "that it will bear a very favorable comparison with the selections from the Idyls of Theocritus, and the songs of Anacreon, which are read in our most approved literary institutions." If it is considered as belonging to this class of productions, let it be read as such, by all who have a taste for it. They will find a great amount of useful information in Dr. Noyes's notes to aid them in their pursuit. For our own part, we are willing to dispense with it, although we feel deeply indebted to the translator for having given it a place in his volume, because we believe "the cause of religion demands that it should be understood to be what it is," and, because to make it so understood, has been the chief reason for its admission into this collection of the Hebrew poems.

Before we take leave of these translations, we would offer a few remarks upon their general excellence. One feature in them which has pleased us particularly is their freedom from many of the Hebrew idioms, which, we think, have hitherto obscured the meaning of the Sacred Writings to a great extent. For example, in Isaiah xvi. 2, we have a description of the daughters of Moab, and in verses 3–5, an address from them to the Jews. But there is nothing to indicate the commencement of the address in the authorized version, because it was a common idiom among the Hebrews to omit the word "saying," which an English writer would have placed at the end of the second verse, and our translators saw fit to bind themselves down to that idiom. Dr. Noyes has avoided it, and the consequence is, that the commencement of the address is distinctly marked, and the whole passage rendered clear. In some places the absence of these Hebraisms may be regretted. For instance, in Ecclesiastes i. 2, the authorized version reads: "Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher, vanity

of vanities, all is vanity;" and we doubt whether the emendation of our author will be readily approved. "Mere vanity, says the preacher, mere vanity, all is vanity." But we think the alteration a good one. It is not so poetical, indeed, but it conveys a more distinct idea to the English reader; in fact it conveys precisely *the* idea of the writer; and since it ought to be the first object of a translator to express the meaning of the original, and not to please the fancy, we are glad that Dr. Noyes has uniformly adhered to this object. This freedom from idioms, now little understood by the community, is, however, only one of the recommendations of these translations. They are characterized throughout by a nice discernment of the meaning of words, by a uniformity of style, by an adherence to the rules of a just criticism, and by a respect for the forms of speech which our associations with the common version have hallowed, whenever they conveyed the meaning of the writers, that lead us to assign the very first rank to Dr. Noyes as a biblical translator. Sincerely do we thank him for his labors, guided as they have been by accurate learning, a sober judgment, and a pure taste. Our hope is that he may find them so well appreciated by the public, as to be induced to apply himself to the translation of the other books of the Old Testament, and to issue the whole, in one volume, at a price which will place it within the reach of all.

[From the Irish Unitarian, (Belfast) July, 1846.]

MODERN ORTHODOXY.

(TRANSLATED FROM M. COQUEREL.)

ON MIRACLES.

THE second point adverted to in our statement of general principles regarded the miracles recorded in Holy Scripture—"We believe in the miracles of the

Old and New Testaments." These words are sufficiently explicit. Certainly they go too far for the most moderate Rationalism, and they are comprehensive enough for the most rigorous orthodoxy. We venture not to add a word to this profession, nor to say what constitutes a miracle. It would be easy to prove that every definition of a miracle hitherto attempted, even the most universally admitted, viz. "A miracle is a temporary and local suspension of a law of Nature," are exceedingly imperfect—do not meet every case, and cannot satisfy the requirements either of reason or religion. But without broaching this disputed point, this we may say, that it is a true triumph for the Christian faith and an immense advantage to its defenders, that although no theologian has yet succeeded in giving a clear definition of a miracle, all the world knows full well without definition what a miracle is. No one is deceived in this particular, and events of this kind offer so many characteristic features, stand out so distinctly from the ordinary record of human affairs, and the usual course of God's Providence, that a miracle always appears miraculous, as a ray of the Sun appears always luminous. This has been proved a thousand times, both in the case of the believer and the skeptic. The one believes what the other denies, but neither can fail to know where the point in controversy is the reality or otherwise of some miraculous narration. A definition of a miracle may therefore be important when one writes a formal defence of the Christian faith, but it is hardly required when one makes a simple statement of his belief. The word MIRACLE is sufficient, it defines itself, and needs no commentary. The idea of direct intervention of divine power is distinctly understood. The fact is admitted as historically true, and the hand of God recognised in its existence. Therefore where the direct and positive intervention of a divine power is seen in any event, there is a miracle; if that intervention is not seen, the event becomes an ordinary his-

torical fact or a natural phenomenon. After this explanation we cannot believe that any Orthodoxy will refuse to admit the qualification we have annexed to our general principle — "We believe in the miracles of Holy Scripture, after having examined by the rules of a sound criticism what facts are to be placed in this class." Not even the most implicit credulity can dispute this position, and pretend to receive facts as miraculous before being assured that they have the marks of miraculous intervention impressed upon them. This is not an ingenious and flexible rule, invented for the advantage of a system, and designed by degrees to efface all miraculous agency from the events recorded in the Holy Scriptures. This is not a magazine which incredulity prepares in advance, where she stores and sharpens weapons for her attack upon the truth of the Bible! Who believes in a miracle without knowing whether it be a miracle or not? The best proof that any event merits the name is the impossibility of explaining it otherwise than by admitting miraculous agency, and this admission implies the previous search into its claims to such agency: if the marks of divine power are obvious, there is a miracle; if not, there is ordinary history, and our TRUST in this method is so assured, that we believe it is impossible that any deception can exist upon the subject.

The wonders wrought by Almighty power are so marvellous, that we have no fear in submitting them to examination. When the lame man in the temple, whose wonderful case is narrated in Acts iii. leaped to his feet and walked, praising God in the presence of the astonished multitude, St. Peter said to the people, "Why look ye so earnestly on US, as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk." So it is with us; we look for a moment to man, the feeble instrument of divine power, and recognising his insufficiency, we lift our eyes to the Divine Being, the true author of the wonder and the blessing.

But it may be objected that in thus minutely examin-

ing the miraculous narratives in Scripture, in thus seeking to ascertain whether they may not be severed from Heaven and brought down to earth, we run the risk of materially reducing their number, and depriving the Sacred Histories of that marvellous feature which so clearly separates them from other records. It is an easy matter to allay this fear without stopping to tax it with superstition.

It is not the number of its miracles which constitutes the value of a religion, it is their greatness, their holiness, their utility, their certainty. The controversy between skepticism and faith turns not upon the point whether there be many or few miracles recorded in the Bible, but whether there be any. One single well authenticated fact of this kind is worth a thousand doubtful, and that the number, compared with the importance of the facts, is of little importance in this matter, the sacred writers themselves have shown, when they declare that Christ and his apostles performed many miracles not recorded in the Gospel history. John xxi. 25.

Very different such a declaration from the course pursued by the compilers of the Books of Legends and Lives of Saints in after times, who appear to think that a multitude of marvels compensated for the want of truth in their recitals, and hope to pass off their bald and meaningless tales by varying and multiplying them without end. If one miracle is true, a thousand may be. If sight is given to one blind man, hearing to one deaf, the use of his limbs to one cripple, health to one leper, — if one tempest is calmed, one loaf increased into ample provision for a multitude, if but once a tomb is opened at Bethany, and he who had lain four days in the grave called forth to life, — what matters it that these wonders are not again and again renewed? Once performed, they are as miraculous, and prove as much, as if they were a thousand times repeated. In one sense they prove more, for it is their greatness that

attracts attention to their rarity. The waves of every sea would have been as easily calmed as the storm on the Lake of Genesareth, and the tombs of all the dead as easily opened as the sepulchre of Lazarus. If there is but one example given in the Gospels, it is simply because the Lord judged one example sufficient.

Another important consideration we should wish to indicate, is this—that God does nothing superfluous. He has permitted sufficient wonders to be performed to afford ample evidence for the faith of the believer, and yet to leave room for the free agency of the man disposed to doubt. The vain fears of those who tremble lest the number of the miracles should be lessened by examination, is distinctly condemned in the words of Abraham to the rich man, who said of his surviving brethren, desiring that an additional miracle should be wrought for their conviction, "If one went unto them from the dead, they would repent;" and Abraham replied, "They have Moses and the Prophets; if they hear them not, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

Nor should it be forgotten, that if we refuse to examine with attention the character of an event before placing it in the rank of a miracle, if we rely solely upon appearances, we run the risk of being deceived, of regarding an ordinary circumstance as a divine prodigy, and of thus attributing to God false marvels unworthy of his nature.

If a narrative in the Scriptures contains some unusual features, the explanation of which is at first sight difficult, some points of detail, which prove how often truth is different from probability, must we hasten to conclude that a miracle has been performed, and add a new marvel to the annals of religion? If Jacob endeavors, in conformity with the prejudice which has prevailed in other and subsequent ages, to multiply his flocks more rapidly than Laban — if Samson finds a swarm of bees in the skeleton of a lion—if Absalom, carried by his mule beneath a tree, is caught by the

hair, and thus dies, ought we, because such narratives are extraordinary, to regard them as miraculous? We hesitate not to say that this absence of reflection—this blind faith—this fear of believing too little and examining too much—is an insult to religion, to the divine origin of the sacred writings, to the glory of the true miracles which they do narrate—an error which, in despoiling the Bible of its simplicity, weakens instead of confirming faith. We go still further, and we avow our conviction that a serious study of the miracles of the Scriptures will not have the effect of decreasing their number. He must know little of the Bible who thinks the contrary. The marvels which it relates are, with few exceptions, so clear and striking—God shows himself in them so near to us, that it is vain to deny their miraculous character, and the unbelief which boldly exclaims, "it is false," is obliged to acknowledge that "*if it be true*, it is divine."

Let the reader review, in imagination, the Life of Moses, and the miracles of Christ and his apostles, and ask himself on what pretence he can refuse to admit the miraculous character which they exhibit. The boldest attempts of Rationalism to explain them in a natural sense have merely confirmed the important truth, that what Revelation proclaims as divine, cannot be reduced to the simple proportions of humanity.

This last remark points to that which constitutes in our eyes an irresistible proof of the truth of the miracles of Scripture, and that is, the impossibility of separating them, or tearing them away from the Gospel history. They do not exist in the form of detached fragments, they are not placed apart in distinct chapters, they are, on the other hand, so united, commingled, and engrained with the rest of the narrative, so bound up with all that accompanies them, with all that follows them, that to remove them is to discard all, as a tissue disappears when the woof is destroyed. This proof, at once religious, historic, and literary, is unquestionably the most forcible reply, perhaps the onl

reply, that can be made to the objections of the unbeliever. Miracles are in the Gospels—they cannot be separated from them—they are bound to Revelation by an indissoluble chain, and in the narrative of Christ's mission, his cradle, his cross, his tomb, and his eternal throne, stand and fall together.

[From the London Inquirer, No. 102.]

THE VOICE OF GOD.

When our first parents underneath the trees
Of Eden wandered,—the soft southern breeze,
Amongst the branches whisp'ring, not alone
Broke on the evening air,—a solemn tone
Fell on their awe-struck senses as they walked—
The living voice of God, which with them talked.

When upon Sinai's rugged mountain-height
The prophet knelt in loneliness and night,
"As a man talketh with his friend," the Lord
With Moses talked;—to him, while thunders roared,
And lightnings filled the Israelites with awe,
The living voice of God proclaimed the law.

And when, o'er Jordan's waters meekly bending,
The Saviour stood, the heavenly Dove descending
Upon his head;—the people, wond'ring, hear
The living voice of God, to mortal ear
Declaring Christ his well-beloved Son,
And the Redeemer's work on earth begun.

That voice has ceased; no more by glancing stream,—
Nor in the garden's shade, or sunny gleam,—
Nor on the mountain, silent and untrod,
May mortal hear the living voice of God.
He, the Creator, slumbers not, nor sleeps,
Yet silently his watch o'er nature keeps.

And yet we do not wander here alone;
A still, small voice, in deep mysterious tone,
Is heard within our hearts,—speaking of fear,
Or gently breathing words of holy cheer.
Christian, attend! it is thy Father's voice;
Oh! follow its commands with loving choice.

THE

UNITARIAN.

[From the Prospective Review, May, 1846.]

AN ESSAY ON PRIMÆVAL HISTORY.

An Essay on Primæval History. By JOHN KENRICK, M. A. London: B. Fellowes. 1846.

THE substance of this Essay was intended to form the introduction to a larger work on the ancient history of Egypt, Assyria, and Phœnicia. But the foundation of such a history involved an inquiry into that shadowy region, which intervenes between the commencement of the human race and the appearance of trustworthy historical materials. What were the actual growths of that region, and what are the sources of our information respecting it? If nature abhors a vacuum, the curiosity of man detests a blank. The ante-historic period must be filled up with something. As *novi homines* find a genealogy indispensable, and if they have not any, must have one made; so nations must know what they did and what happened to them, before they were nations, or, in the absence of such knowledge, they must draw bills on the all-accommodating bank of imagination. There is no European family of any distinction without an ancestry, true or false; and there is no civilized nation without a history more or less fanc' ful in the præ-historic age. These have, for the m

part, occasioned the student, if not little trouble, at least but little anxiety. He has had no hesitation in dealing summarily with the whole of this period in the case of every nation but one. He has smiled at the astronomical cycles of the Chinese and Indians, and resolved their prized antiquity into arithmetical skill. He has, indeed, striven to worm out the truth that might lie hidden beneath the fable, but he has not felt bound to take the fable as he found it. Thus we have applied the screw of rationalistic commentary to the mythic and heroic age of Greece, and have determined, if we received its facts at all, to receive them only with a reduction of stature and proportions. So has the hand of Newton, and, after it, that of Niebuhr, ruthlessly shattered, not only the Rhea Sylvian, but much of the Regal age of Rome.

The only filling up of the præ-historic period which has claimed exemption from this kind of criticism and inquiry is that handed down to us in the venerable records of the Hebrew people. The retributory action of time is here remarkable; for this was, of all the efforts to search into the dim regions of the human unknown, the most neglected and unnoticed by those nations, then in the ascendant of civilization, whose own notions on the same hidden subject it has superseded and thrown down.

The accounting cause of this change is the conversion of the world to Christianity. The divine origin of the Gospel involved an acknowledgment of the divine origin of Judaism. Christ and the Apostles were the later and more perfect succession to Moses and the Prophets. When the canon of the New Testament was formed, the spirit of this union required the extension of a similar sanction to the canon of the Old. If Moses bare witness to Christ, Christ should reflect his sanction upon Moses. If the writings of the Old Testament foreshadowed those of the New, the writings of the New should adopt under their shield the

writings of the Old. Thus came, not only the more recent and prophetic writings, but those assigned to the earlier, the legislative and historic period, to be received as of equal authority with the Gospels and the Epistles; and the documents, containing the speculations of the Hebrew people on the origin and formation of the world, and the early history of man, previous to any regular and ascertained data, became invested with divine authority, and endowed with all the bindingness of a Creed.

Thus has it come to pass that the vast ante-historic period, once free to inquiry and speculation, has become practically closed — no inquirer daring to go ostensibly in opposition to, or in deviation from, any of the lines which the Hebrew record has laid down with the strength of ramparts; and the investigations of the Linguist, the Physiologist, the Astronomer, the Ethnographer and the Geologist have been bound hand and foot by an arbitrary theological enactment — into the authority of which it becomes high time to inquire.

Candor and his subject alike required of Mr. Kenrick that he should grapple with this question. Those Historians who select a single people for their subject, have only to begin with the first traces of their appearance as a people. Those who begin with the later epochs of general History and proceed upwards to the earlier, may pause when they like, or may divaricate in their line. But the Historian of the most ancient nations of the East — by universal belief the cradle of the human race — is of necessity to a great extent the Historian of man. Beginning with the beginning, he must ascertain, in the very outset, where and what that beginning is, and if he have before him documents of perhaps unsurpassed antiquity, and certainly of generally-received authority, he must either follow them, or state his reasons for not following them. The endeavor to ascertain, as a faithful historian, the genuine character of these writings, involved our author in the consideration of

authority, the chronology, and the truth of the earlier Bible History, and as the results to which he was driven were very different from those usually arrived at, or rather, usually avowed, he deemed it better to publish separately his thoughts on this preliminary question, that the tide of his future work might flow on unimpeded by the rocks and shoals of theological controversy.

As bespeaking attention to the future work — as bringing anything from Mr. Kenrick's pen, a little sooner than otherwise before us, we are grateful for the determination of the author; but as in some measure sanctioning the unnatural attempt to separate scientific from theological matter, and making it appear that you may treat the Bible history in one book, and the secular in another, in fact, saving the merely historical student from a question which it is more important than ever he should candidly examine — we in some degree regret the separation of this preliminary dissertation from the rest of the work. The examination of authorities is a legitimate portion of any historical undertaking, and may be conducted *pari passu* with the progress of the history itself. As it is, the Theologian perhaps will be satisfied with this treatise apart from its historical consequent; and we fear that the Historian may be so with the subsequent work, apart from its theological antecedent.

If, however, there be anything in this objection, it will be easily removed by the union hereafter, of the *disjecta membra*. In the meantime it is evident that the author had an immediate, though undeclared, object, in the present particularly well-timed publication. It is intended to exercise a liberating power in directions where science is held in shackles by unfounded and uncritical canons; and a repressive power, where its appropriate severity and exactness are endangered by too great a latitude, allowed to imagination and conjecture. It is designed to give liberty, and to discourage license. It apprizes the inquirer that he must not lean with too

great reliance on the catechism of primæval truths, which he has been in the habit of repeating from Genesis without a question, and that there does not exist in the Bible or out of it, any giant-form of ascertained physical and historical fact, before which all his theories must bow the knee, and with which all his inquiries and investigations must necessarily be brought into harmony. While broadly declaring to the slave of the Canon, that what he thinks is known is *not known*, he hints to the freer speculator that he must not be too ready to believe that by any other means it *can* be known. He wishes to impress on both the absolute twilight of primæval history, which has too many rays for usurped authority, but perhaps also too few for the clear establishment of any definite historic throne.

But to the Book itself. Given the Church Proposition, — that everything within the Canon is divine and true, — all other facts and theories must tally with it, or be rejected. The result of this has been an incessant struggle between the bar thus raised by art and man's device, and the natural flow of human inquiry. As long as the questions that interested mankind were metaphysical, the sanction of scripture authority was without difficulty ensured to the most various opinions. The Canon itself containing a great diversity of view, and this being also expressed in free and popular phraseology, opinions might be to all appearance reconciled with it, which could not be reconciled with each other. Thus the paralyzing effect of the Proposition upon human inquiry was not for many ages practically perceived. But when the questions which came to be discussed were physical, and the space which the Bible devoted to the most important of them was exceedingly minute, and the language in which it expressed them of unrivalled explicitness and distinctness — then the fetter began to gall : —

"A skilful metaphysician" — says Mr. Kenrick — "might undertake to reconcile free will with predestination — a skilful

commentator, St. Paul with St. James; but to reconcile the Copernican system of the universe with a phraseology founded on the belief of the revolution of the heavenly bodies around the earth, was clearly impossible."—Preface, viii.

Nature and truth were too strong for the theologians, and though the Church Proposition apparently stood its ground, its actual defeat dated from the moment in which the Tuscan astronomer pronounced the words, "It moves." In order, however, to preserve to it the semblance of inviolability, it was said that mere conformity with popular language respecting the phænomena of Nature was no evidence of agreement with popular belief—that though the common phraseology was used to convey intelligence to the common mind, it by no means followed that the writer who conformed to that phraseology adopted the rude ideas from which it originally arose. "A Philosopher's ordinary language and admissions in general conversation"—says Coleridge—"or in his writings *ad populum*, are as his watch compared with his astronomical time-piece. He sets the former by the Town Clock, not because he believes it right, but because his neighbors and his Cook go by it."

On this principle the authority of Moses came out once again apparently, though no more than before really, scatheless. When time and reflection made more and more holes in this veil, it was next declared that the Scriptures were not to be brought into court as evidence on physical subjects at all, because this was a class of topics with which they only dealt incidentally, and in which they professed to give no express instruction. This was an insufficient answer, but it lasted for a time. Then came Geology, not in its crude beginnings and conjectures, but in its matured and irrefragable results—and the prop of the old Scripturalist fell from beneath him.

"It is quite clear that the intention of the Hebrew writer was to teach the philosophy of the universe, and the history and

order of creation, according to the conceptions of his age. They may seem to us rude and simple; we may be at a loss to reconcile them with the discoveries of modern science; but we cannot doubt that his narrative was propounded and received in the full belief of its truth."— Preface, xi.

What, then, was to be done with the Church's Proposition, and the persevering inquiries of the scientific? There was yet another resource. Perhaps we did not understand the first Chapter of Genesis. It might, after all, speak the language of nature and knowledge. "In the beginning," might apply only to the first formation of the heavens and the earth; and the completion of the globe, and the creation of man, might have followed in remote subsequent ages. This has been a favorite interpretation with modern theologians, who were open to the facts of science, while they desired to adhere to the divine authority of the whole Canon: but the conjecture was not of modern origin, being, as many similar ones, "of the Fathers." In like manner, a different sense was to be given to the word "Create," and even (spite of the "evening and the morning" marking the limit to a single revolution of the earth) to the word "Day." Of such interpretations, which he dismisses with disapprobation, Mr. Kenrick truly says that they are not warranted by philosophy, nor in accordance with the obvious meaning of the writer: and in reference to these attempts generally, he observes:—

"The apparent flexibility which Scripture has exhibited in the hands of its commentators, and the contradictory opinions which have been deduced from it, may have led those who are not conversant with Hebrew philology and biblical hermeneutic, to suppose the meaning much more uncertain than it really is. No doubt, the Hebrew language and literature present greater difficulties to an interpreter than those of Greece and Rome. Job and Hosea are not of such simple and obvious construction as Homer and Euripides. It happens, however, that the portion of Scripture which relates to cosmogony and primæval history, is remarkably free from philological difficulties. The meaning of the writer, the only thing which the interpreter has to discover and set forth, is everywhere sufficiently obvious; there is

hardly, in these eleven Chapters a doubtful construction, or a various reading of any importance, and the English reader has, in the ordinary version, a full and fair representation of the sense of the original."—Preface, xiv. See also Essay, p. 45–46.

Where, therefore, Bellarmine, and after him Professor Whewell, allow the necessity of adopting *new interpretations* of Scripture, rendered necessary by new discoveries, Mr. Kenrick suggests that these Authors must surely rather mean, that "our ideas of the *authority* of certain portions of Scripture should be modified." It is with great tenderness and delicacy that our Author goes about what is, to less honest and conscientious writers, a too ungrateful task, namely, the rectifying these mistaken ideas of the authority of the primæval history in Genesis. It is but fair to his views to quote these observations:—

"Compared with the rude efforts of the most civilized people to solve the problem of the world's existence, and connect themselves by an unbroken chain with the origin of all things, the narrative of the Creation in the book of Genesis is remarkable for its sublimity and truth. It speaks a plain and simple language, ascribes everything to the benevolent purpose of one wise and omnipotent being, and relates the successive stages of creation in general harmony with the discoveries of science, though by no means with that exact accordance which has sometimes been asserted. But though such a narrative could only have been produced among a people divinely instructed in the great truths which distinguish revealed from natural religion, it has evidently received its form from the popular belief. To regard it in all its details, as the authorized history of the changes of the globe, from the time when all was 'without form, and void,' to the creation of man, would require that we should either close our eyes to the evidence of science, or adopt interpretations of the text which are not warranted by philology."—Essay, p. 9.

Thus reverently, and as it were unwillingly, does our Author go about his task of correcting a deeply-grounded, but most mischievous error. And nothing to our mind proves the insincerity, the duplicity, the ignorant warfare, the secret skeptical sarcasm, the obstruction to honest

scientific advance, that this theory of the Church has through now so many generations occasioned, more than the fact that a cautious, learned man, of a nature more conservative than destructive, should feel himself drawn out of his reverential attitude, to tell, or rather simply to enunciate to the world, a most needful word of truth. This is one of the worst mischiefs that accrue from pious frauds of every description, that men are allowed to gather round them so many of the props and pillars of their faith, that they cannot be recovered to the truth, without a shock to these. It illustrates well the remark of Sir James Mackintosh, when speaking of "the infatuation of those who, in their eagerness to rivet the bigotry of the ignorant, use means which infallibly tend to spread utter unbelief among the educated."

But the cosmogony of Genesis, it is well known, is not the only thing that has "exercised" the Commentators. The descent of all mankind from one pair, the immense recorded duration of ante-diluvian life, the Deluge and its accompaniments and effects, the chronology which allows only 400 years between the dispeopling of the earth and the migrations of Abraham through re-peopled countries, and lastly, the impossibility of proving the inspiration of an historical book, especially one beset with such difficulties as Genesis, combine to force from our Author the confession, that the materials for primæval history found in the first eleven chapters of Genesis are not to be relied upon.

Mr. Kenrick by no means denies the possibility of mankind being descended from one pair, but he denies the possibility of their being so descended in the time usually said to have elapsed since the creation of man. It is possible that the now striking differences in complexion, form and language, among the various races of the globe, may be accounted for by the action of such causes as have been copiously dwelt upon by Prichard and Wiseman in this country, and Blumenbach in Germany. All that Mr. Kenrick denies, is, that these

changes can have been effected in six, or rather four thousand years. And he evidently inclines, in opposition to these Writers, to the belief in a diversity of original stocks, unless there is allowed an immensely-increased period of time for the production of the differences which now exist. This tendency to believe rather in "the tenacity with which nature adheres to her established forms, than the flexibility with which she varies them," places him also in opposition to the Author of the Vestiges. "The Negro, with all his peculiarities of form, color, and hair, appears just the same in the paintings of the age of Thothmes III., fifteen centuries before the Christian æra, as he is now seen in the interior of Africa."

"It is difficult to assign limits to the influence of climate, joined to that of soil, food, and modes of life, in producing changes in the human form. It is probable that its range was greater when civilization was less diffused, which enables man to protect himself against the injurious effects of the elements, and gives variety to his occupations, his clothing, and diet."—"In general, however, the survey of those races whose successive conditions we can ascertain, presents to us rather the proofs of the tenacity with which nature adheres to her established forms, than the flexibility with which she varies them. Still these forms are not absolutely unchangeable: we see nations whose language proclaims them to have descended from a common stock, exhibiting a different complexion and features, according to the country which they occupy, and we cannot presume to say how far this assimilating power extends. No known effect of climate is adequate to account for the existing varieties of complexion. We see no tendency in the Negro race settled in North America, to approach the color of the Whites, though other peculiarites of the Negro are said to wear out in those who are the most perfectly domesticated. On the other hand, no tendency displays itself, in the white races established in intertropical climates, whose population is black, to approach the color of the natives, if there be no intermarriage between them, much less to assume their osteological and physiological characters."—P. 16–18.

The objection to ante-diluvian longevity is thus stated:—

"Such a prolongation of human life is a perpetual miracle. It is contrary to all analogy that living beings, *the same in species*, should differ from each other in length of life by several centuries. When a naturalist collects the proofs of identity of species, he does not fail to include conformity in the duration of life. Beings whose lives extended to nearly 1,000 years, must have been physically, morally, and intellectually different from ourselves, whose average does not exceed three score years and ten. They cannot, therefore, have been our progenitors. If to avoid this difficulty, we suppose that *year* meant some other length of time than twelve months in this part of the history, we cut ourselves off from all possibility of establishing a chronology, the value of its unit being uncertain. If we say that there is some error in the reckoning, we undermine the authority of a document, into which we admit that so grave an error can have crept." — P. 58.

To get rid of the fatally short time allowed by the chronology of Genesis for the great change which it records, some have preferred the authority of the Samaritan copy, and many that of the Septuagint version, to the original Hebrew text, the Septuagint allowing upwards of 1,200 years from the deluge to the call of Abraham, and the Hebrew only 427 ; and between the Creation and the call of Abraham, the Septuagint making 3,469, and the Hebrew only 2,083. But the very discrepancy is fatal to the reception of either authority,— to the Septuagint, because the variation is systematic, a hundred years being regularly added to the age of the father at the time of the birth of his eldest son, and the same number as regularly subtracted from the length of his life after that event,— and to the Hebrew, because it is manifest that the incredible and impossible nature of its chronology led to this tampering with its dates.

The result of the inquiry instituted in this succinct and learned Essay is this, that "about 3,000 years before the Christian æra is the utmost limit to which we can carry up the history of civilization," (and this only by the help of Egyptian remains,) "and from this time to our own, the line of its descent is unbroken." The

ages previous to this date are consigned to the guardianship of Myth. The mythic period commences in different countries at different times, because the historic age begins at an earlier date among some people than among others. Egyptian monarchs were raising monuments, and making inscriptions, while Greece was, by its own account, governed by Demigods; and Odin was playing the God in Scandinavia, while philosophy (if we may not go even later, and say Christianity) was displacing Jupiter in Rome. Still the mythic period has a quasi-historic value; if we cannot learn from it what *was*, we can at least learn what was believed or imagined. If "we discard from our minds all belief in the personality and adventures of Cadmus," we may learn from the myth that the Greeks themselves believed that they owed some of their civilization to Phœnicia. The mere myth which ascribed the buildings of Tiryns and Argos to the Cyclops, might tell us, without the testimony of any remains, that they were colossal and remotely ancient.

"What has been commonly called *conjectural* history, has been unsatisfactory, because it has proceeded upon unproved assumptions respecting the primitive condition of mankind, and has been carried out by means of doubtful analogies. But if we assume nothing except the facts which constitute our earliest historical knowledge, and seek to explain them from the faculties and affections of man, which in all ages are the same, we shall approach as nearly to a knowledge of primæval history, as we can do in the absence of positive testimony."—P. 93.

The remainder of the Essay is devoted to the following out of these dark hints of the primæval history. There is a line finely drawn between the hypothesis of self-development, and the usual theory of unchanging races.

"It may be a law of Nature that the altered condition of the elements shall be slowly followed by changes of organs and structure which at length amount to specific or even generic differences; or it may have been the order of creative operation,

to bring into being new races, whenever the earth, in its progress from its primæval to its present state, was prepared generally or partially to receive and preserve them. On either supposition the correspondence between the world and its inhabitants, at any given period, is the result of adaptation; either equally excludes the absurdity of self-production. The question cannot be decided by historical evidence, but this, as far as it goes, is unfavorable to the supposition that Nature gradually exchanges one species for another. We trace nothing like a waste of power in abortive attempts to produce new forms, subsequently abandoned from their unsuitableness. We see in the present order of things, no tendency to the production of new species, nor to the extinction of the old, except by violent causes."—P. 101.

In short, there is a stamp of permanence, according to our Author, about Nature, both in the animal and the vegetable world, which disinclines him to believe that man was ever anything but man, or a potato anything but a potato. He denies us any longer the pleasant old theory that all mankind once lived by the chase, and then pastured cattle, and then grew wheat. It would depend upon whether game, or pasture, or fish, were most abundant in their several neighborhoods.

"History does not furnish a single example of a nation emerging by its own efforts from the condition of hunters, fishers, or shepherds. Such changes have always been brought about by contact with a more civilized race, and very generally purchased by the loss of national independence, or even personal liberty."—P. 109.

And yet it is allowed that the capacity for *self-improvement* belongs to man alone — that it is the *alte terminus hærens* which alone gives him a history; and whence did the Conquerors obtain their civilization?

With the exception of such slight indications of a predisposition (without which Neander maintains no man can approach any investigation), our Author has accomplished his undertaking without prejudice, or prepossession, and in the simple love of Truth. His predisposition is against guesses and conjectures, and he

upholds in opposition the sovereignty of History and the solemnity of Fact. The Essay possesses not therefore the charm of a cleverly-imagined and ingeniously-sustained Theory. Its value consists in the absence of such a charm. Mr. Kenrick forbids Imagination to appear in the field, except *as* Imagination. He will only have two sides to all questions — what we *know*, and what we do not know. His concern is principally to make the landmark between these two — the known and the unknown — distinct and recognizable, that we may not suppose we know what in fact we do not, or that we do *not* know what in fact we do. His desire is to break off the fetters from one set of men, and place a mild hand of restraint upon another. The dose of heresy in the book is homœopathic, (the rejection as plenary and faithful history, of the eleven first Chapters of Genesis,) but it is administered with a full sense of the responsibility of the adviser, and the instant necessity of the prescription. We beg the reader not to judge of the learning and style of the Essay by the points we have brought before him. We have only touched with a current hand on the *loci communes* of the field it opens out to us, and directed no attention to its nobler qualities of thought, its exactness of diction, its easy and comprehensive learning, and its entire honesty. The book may not contain much that is strictly new to the student, but its condensation and comprehensiveness will render it a grateful offering, even to him, and an invaluable gift, if it will accept it, to that large portion of the English Public who are anxious for guidance on the deeply interesting topics of early human history. It contains almost the first thoroughly honest and out-spoken word from the learned world which they have yet had. May the mission of the Essay be accomplished! which we take to be to ensure its freedom to investigation, and its sacredness to Truth.

[From the Irish Unitarian Magazine, (Belfast) July, 1846.]

CONGREGATIONAL PSALMODY.

"To the Editor of the Irish Unitarian Magazine and Bible Christian."

SIR, — Since you published in the first number of your new series, a few general observations, drawing public attention to the subject of "Congregational Psalmody," and some of the causes which have retarded its improvement, I have met with a music-book, published by Gall and Son, of Edinburgh, with which I think it is desirable that every congregation, and every individual who takes any interest in psalmody, should be acquainted. It is entitled "British Psalmody;" and contains 437 tunes, in 47 varieties of metre—all harmonized for four voices—embracing the standard Psalmody of England and Scotland — and of course many of the tunes we have most been accustomed to in Ulster. This 8vo volume is neatly and accurately printed, and elegantly bound; extending to 272 pages for the very moderate price of 4*s*. For convenience, in the cultivation of singing, the publisher has divided it into two parts—the "Psalm Tune-Book," and the "Hymn Tune-Book," — each for 2*s*., and has also made a farther subdivision of each of these into four parts, at from 3*d*. to 4*d*. each.

Thus, the first step to the improvement of Congregational Psalmody and popular music, is effected by the publication of cheap tune-books of standard music; and I may not only indulge the hope, but express a certainty, that this most important subject will receive the advocacy and support which it so well merits, both from the pulpit and the press, and the musical reproach of our churches may soon cease to be a by-word.

Before bringing the book thus into notice, I consulted others of superior musical taste and judgment, who concur generally, that there is much, both in the melodies and harmonies, to please every variety of taste, and make it a general favorite.

I cannot refrain from making a short extract from the admirably written preface, a copy of which should be in every church pew.

"It is difficult to say which is the greater abuse of music—the slovenly, heartless singing of an assembly of professing worshippers, uneducated in music—or the genteel silence of a fashionable audience, which deputes to some hired organist or choir the performance of the solemn and sacred *duty* of worshipping God. Have not our churches been guilty of both? We must confess, that we have not given to God the best of our music — nor has the investigation of its simple sublimities been undertaken with a view to His glory. We must also plead guilty to the charge, that the education of the people in the art of singing, has not occupied that share of the attention of our churches to which it is entitled: the best of this gift of God has been employed in the service of the world—the worst has been reckoned good enough for Him."

Hoping that this short notice may induce many to ask themselves, how they are performing their part in the music of the sanctuary? and that it may draw forth advocates competent to do justice to the subject,—I remain, yours,

PHILHARMONICUS.

[From the Unitarian, (London) July, 1846.]

THOUGHTS ON THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

I HAVE thus endeavored to show, that God hath made man *right*;—by which I mean, not merely that he made Adam right, but that human nature *at present*, such as we find it in ourselves and observe in our fellow mortals around us, is what our Creator intended it to be—an admirable combination of powers and capacities well adapted to the present condition of man, and imposing on him moral responsibilities proportioned to their ex-

cellence and value. They are precisely what Infinite wisdom has perceived to be best fitted to accomplish the ends of his creation. What are these ends?—Evidently that he should be the instrument of promoting the welfare of his brethren,—that he should be useful and happy here, and cultivate those moral habits and dispositions which may render him capable of greater happiness hereafter. We do not say that he brings into the world with him any moral character whatever;—he is not born holy and good, any more than he is born sinful; but his original frame, and the condition in which Providence has placed him, are such as to render this life a scene of education and discipline, well fitted to promote the growth of all those dispositions and feelings which are suitable to an heir of God and a candidate for Heaven. If unhappily the result is different, it is not our *nature* that is to blame, but our own wilful neglect and abuse of the powers with which we have been endowed.

This is a subject on which no small portion of confusion and error has prevailed, leading in many cases, as there is too much reason to believe, to very pernicious practical consequences. But if the views we have endeavored to explain be well founded, the sinner will no longer be able to plead in his excuse, that he was created with a nature capable of nothing better, and the way will be opened for more direct and impressive appeals to his conscience and his heart. He will be made to perceive that he is *by nature* just as liable to sin as Adam was before him, and no more so. The *causes*, too, of this liability, are the same; namely, those very principles which are the greatest marks of favor from a wise and good Creator, and which demand our most grateful returns; a gratitude displayed not merely in the outward language of thanksgiving, but in the most careful attention so to guide and use these gifts as to promote the purposes for which they were bestowed.

It is my present object to examine somewhat more particularly the grounds upon which the erroneous notions so generally received are commonly built, in order to show that they have no real foundation either in reason or in Scripture. And in doing this, while zealous not merely to support the truth, but to expose error,—in order to guard against any sentiments or feelings inconsistent with Christian charity, let us carefully avoid all reference to the character or proceedings of those who have espoused the error;—unless it be for the purpose of acknowledging, which I now do with equal sincerity and pleasure, that many, perhaps most of them, are far from having actually adopted the pernicious practical conclusions which appear to me to be fairly deducible from it, and into which I am fully persuaded that some have been unhappily betrayed.

When we are examining the opinions of others, it seems to

be the fairest way to state them in the terms in which they are usually expressed by those who maintain them; especially if there be any formal statement existing, which is commonly received, recognised, and appealed to, as of standard authority. In this light I believe the exposition of the doctrine of Original Sin, contained in what is called the Assembly's Catechism, is still generally acknowledged.

"Our first parents," we are told in this formulary, "being left to the freedom of their own will, through the temptation of Satan transgressed the commandment of God in eating the forbidden fruit, and thereby fell from the state of innocency wherein they were created. The covenant being made with Adam as a *public person*, not for himself only, but for his posterity, all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him in that first transgression. The sinfulness of that state whereinto man fell, consisteth in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of that righteousness wherein he was created, and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to, all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually;—which is commonly called Original Sin, and from which do proceed all actual transgressions. Original Sin is conveyed from our first parents to their posterity by natural generation, so as all that proceed from them in that way are conceived and born in sin. The fall brought upon mankind the loss of communion with God, his displeasure and curse, so that we are by nature children of wrath, bond slaves to Satan, and justly liable to all punishments in this world and that which is to come."

When we are called upon to receive as articles of faith such propositions as these, the first impulse is to compare them, not with Scripture, but with experience;—with the history of mankind, with our own observation of human character and human life. Nor let it be supposed that we are not fully authorized and enabled to make this comparison, and to form our judgment of the doctrine accordingly. We are endowed with moral faculties, which enable us to perceive the distinction between right and wrong;—it is by the exercise of these faculties, and in no other way, that we are led to acknowledge our own obligation to obey a certain law, to recognise the justice and equity of that law, and to compare our conduct and that of others with its requisitions. Nay, we are both authorized and required to apply the same principle as a standard to what we behold of the moral government of God himself;— it is thus, and thus only that we can be convinced that the Judge of all the earth must do right, and that all His appointments are just and good. This, at least, must be admitted; for were it otherwise,— (as some, it is true have actually contended) — if our moral and rational powers

were all utterly depraved and corrupted by "the fall," so as to be naturally incapable of perceiving what was just and true, it would be to as little purpose to call upon us to form any judgment or opinion about the matter, as to call upon a blind man to judge of colors.

Whatever, then, we may think of this or of any other method of accounting for the supposed fact, let us look around us, let us look *within*, and ask ourselves the plain question,—*is it true*, I do not say that all men, but that *any man*, is "wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually"? Undoubtedly there are many vicious and profligate characters in the world; and we should look in vain even for one of whom it could be said in the language applied to our blessed Lord, that in him the Father was always well-pleased. But have we ever seen, heard or read of any person so thoroughly depraved and abandoned, as to warrant us in saying that in the whole course of his life he never once did a good action, never once said or imagined anything which was dictated by an affectionate disposition to serve his brethren, and was consequently at no period and from no individual of his fellow-creatures the object of any other sentiment than that of unmitigated dislike and hatred? It would be only to *such* a being that we could fairly apply the description of this *orthodox* creed,—but I will venture to say that no such monster ever appeared to blacken the history of mankind. If it were possible that all the members of any community deserved such a character as this, it would soon cease to exist;—for all the relations of life would quickly be dissolved, the ties which bind men together in society would be broken asunder, and the scattered fragments would rapidly disappear and perish.

If our experience thus leads us to question the existence of a single human being thoroughly abandoned, without one redeeming quality, much more does it call upon us to affirm of very many of our fellow-creatures, that (in the midst, undoubtedly, of multiplied imperfections and sins) a large portion of their lives has been spent in a manner which has made them the objects of general esteem, and has attracted the approbation and love of those who have the best means of knowing them. This much may even be said of not a few who, according to the principles of this system, must be classed among the unregenerate; as having had no means of attaining the knowledge of religious truth—or, knowing, have doubted or even rejected it.

In all states of society, and in every period of human history, the evidence of fact and experience has been decidedly opposed to this extravagant doctrine. There has been abundance of wickedness no doubt; and even in countries blessed with the sacred light of gospel truth, there is not one who has not cause enough for deep humiliation and penitence in the sight of God;

but this admission is not inconsistent with the assertion, that the prevailing sentiments and feelings of mankind are on the whole favorable to virtue; — nay, that if we take the average of human *character*, we shall find virtue the rule, and wickedness the exception. Were it otherwise, how should we account for the fact, that integrity, truth, generosity, benevolence and piety are objects of respect, esteem and admiration among mankind? Why is it that vice does not universally stalk abroad, and boast of its achievements without reserve? Why does hypocrisy find it advisable to assume the garb of holiness? Why are the flagrant crimes of which we occasionally hear the sad and afflicting details, the objects of general horror and detestation? Why are they so much the objects of general attention and remark? Why, but because, after all, they are the exception, and not the rule. If, as we might be led to suppose, they were the common order of things, we should pass them by with indifference and unconcern. If it were true that man, by nature, is a hater of God and of his neighbor, *these* are the characters which would meet with popular applause and sympathy. Virtue, *as such*, would be despised and hated; vice, *as such*, esteemed and admired. How opposite to all this is the experience of human life, it is unnecessary to say. The most distinguished moralists have shown, by an appeal to this experience, that even the practice, and still more the prevailing opinions of mankind, may furnish us with a rule of life, imperfect, it is true, and in some points erroneous, but yet on the whole favorable to virtue; which could never have happened, if men had been, in the language of this creed, wholly incapable of good, and unceasingly inclined to all manner of evil.* If it be alleged that the natural man is incom-

* See an interesting and valuable application of this general remark to the formation of what may be called an *approximate* standard of morality, in that part of "Hartley's Observations on Man," entitled the "Rule of Life," which is devoted to the investigation of this important subject, and contains a copious fund of excellent practical suggestions for the conduct of life in its various relations, which I will venture to affirm that no man can study with the attention it requires and well deserves, without being made both wiser and better.

I am aware, that some advocates of the doctrine we are now examining, have called this principle of moral reasoning in question; — and one living writer of high reputation and authority with his party, Dr. Wardlaw, in a work entitled "Christian Ethics," has denied that either the enquiries and reasonings of philosophers, or the prevailing sentiments of mankind, are deserving of the least regard in the formation of a rule of morals. Setting aside the law of conscience, written in the hearts of men, he contends that we must appeal exclusively to the Bible; interpreted of course in conformity with what are called orthodox principles. In drawing this conclusion, and repudiating all appeal to human reason in connexion with this subject, the author is quite correct and consistent; but it appears to me that the very circumstance of

petent to judge upon this point because his faculties are all depraved and corrupted by the fall, I reply that this is to put an end at once to all reasoning on the subject. The very asking me to assent to the propositions, this is right and that is wrong, this good and that evil, implies that I have faculties which enable me to distinguish between the one and the other. It is to their decision, in fact, that the final appeal must be made; and I should no more think of listening to the man who questioned this, than to him who, when the noon-day sun was shining around me, would fain persuade me that it was all a delusion, and that I was really in midnight darkness.

But it is time to pay some attention to the Scripture proofs which are adduced in support of this doctrine; though in fact, of all the false additions which have been made to the simple truths of the Gospel, there is scarcely one for which the shadow of Scriptural argument commonly alleged is so meagre and imperfect. The first appeal, of course, is made to the history of Adam's first transgression as given in the book of Genesis. There is scarcely any passage in the Bible with respect to which greater license has been used in drawing doctrinal conclusions than this. Few, if any, have been contented with the literal interpretation; and those who call themselves orthodox, least of all; assuming much that is altogether unauthorized by the record. Man is there said to have been created in the image of God; and St. James tells us that *all men* are made after the similitude of God; the creed adds, without authority, "in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness." No hint is given in the original record of *Satan* as an agent in the business. Nor is there any better authority for the assertion that Adam was according to the technical phrase, "a public person" — the federal head or representative of all his posterity; so that when he sinned all mankind sinned in him, and became liable to his punishment. Not one word do we find from the beginning to the end of this narrative, which gives the smallest hint of any *covenant* whatever; still less a covenant of so extraordinary a character, that the sin of him who violated it was transferred or imputed to the very persons on whose behalf he acted, and whom he injured by his transgression. If it had been so, is it not most unaccountable that Moses, in writing a history of this transaction, should have

---

its leading to such a conclusion, is enough to show that the system from which it is derived as a necessary consequence, must be false. Besides, how are we to satisfy ourselves of the authority of the Bible, to which he refers us as containing the word of God? In no other way than by the exercise of those same rational faculties, which this system elsewhere represents as utterly unfit to furnish us with any conclusion that can be relied upon.

omitted the most important feature of it, and that which made it chiefly interesting to mankind in every succeeding age?

Commentators, in their attempts to explain this history, have given almost unbounded scope to their imaginations; and I do not propose at present to add to the number, because it is not necessary to our present purpose. That it is not to be interpreted strictly by the letter seems certain; but whatsoever view we take of it, the narrative gives us no reason for supposing that Adam, in respect of any mental or moral quality, had the slightest advantage over his posterity. On the contrary, as far as we can draw any inference at all from the account here given, of the law imposed, of the temptation and the disobedience, it indicates a moral character very inferior in strength and perfection to that of many of his descendants. As far as it appears, the trial before which his virtue gave way, was not to be compared to those which were gloriously resisted by Joseph, by Daniel, by a host of martyrs and confessors in later times, of whom the world was not worthy. *Their* characters had been matured by education, by experience, by the accumulated wisdom of ages, by the varied relations they sustained to their fellow-creatures, calling forth into exercise a multitude of affections and feelings which as yet lay dormant in our first parents for want of objects to call them forth. Accordingly, when we compare the two, it is like contrasting the achievements of full grown men with the petty trials of children. At his first creation, Adam must of course have been furnished, by supernatural communication, with certain kinds of knowledge, and with various practical habits; otherwise he must have instantly perished, because the human constitution does not exhibit that variety of instinctive principles which, in many of the lower animals, supersede experience, and in some measure supply its place. Whatever notions of duty and moral obligation he possessed, must have been received in this way; but to suppose that he was thus supernaturally endowed with anything corresponding to that enlargement and comprehension of mind, that strength and maturity of moral character, which many of his posterity have acquired as the slow result of a long course of education and discipline, is both highly improbable in itself, and without the shadow of a warrant from anything recorded in Scripture.

Assuming, then, that such was the original character of Adam before his first transgression—rational, but weak and inexperienced—liable to sin like every other human being, but imperfectly provided with those principles and moral habits which the discipline of ages, under the direction of a wise Providence, has since enabled his descendants to acquire; receiving a law, adapted in the plainness and simplicity of its single requirement to his comparatively feeble, and, if I may so call it, *infantile*

state of mind—and yet yielding to the first attack of temptation; —we cannot but be struck with the absurdity of holding him up as the model of humanity, the mirror of intellectual and moral perfection, entitled, in that capacity, to covenant in the name and on behalf of the whole human race. The history, as given by Moses, presents no trace of any such thing; nor should we even infer from anything it contains, when taken by itself, that the consequences of his sin were in any way visited upon his descendants. We may, however, deduce from it the instructive and salutary lesson, that a Paradise on earth, in bowers of bliss, relieved from the necessity of daily toil, is not fit for man in his present state. In such a condition he might vegetate, but there would be no stimulating motive to action, no advance, no improvement. A life of uniform, unbroken tranquillity, without struggle, difficulty, or contest, would be insufficient to unfold and exercise his powers. A more varied, a more effective, a sterner discipline is required to awaken his energies, and rouse him to exertion. The condition in which we find him placed is more conducive to that development of his moral and spiritual character which his residence in this world was evidently intended to promote. The more extended and diversified relations which he now sustains with his fellow-creatures, lead him to take an interest in their welfare, and thus unfold his affections, and furnish him with the most lively and effectual motives to vigorous effort. Having experienced evil as well as good, he knows how to choose the one and flee from the other. The school of adversity teaches him patience under suffering, it also nerves his arm to contend against the foe; it teaches him sympathy and benevolence; "from his own, he learns to melt at others' woe," to pity, to love his fellow partners of mortality.

If (as we are perhaps entitled to infer from the very few slight and imperfect imitations to be found in Scripture) these rougher elements of our moral culture, and *death* at its close, were introduced after Adam's sin—affecting him as its *punishment*, and all the rest of mankind as its *consequence*, it may be allowed indeed that we *suffer* through our relation to him; but we shall also perceive that these seeming evils are so far from being marks of the *wrath* of an offended God, that they are instruments in the hands of a wise and gracious Father for training us up to a fitness for glory and happiness hereafter. Even our blessed Saviour was made perfect through sufferings—and we advance on our pilgrimage by various tribulations and afflictions, piercing our souls with many sorrows, along a path chequered with many difficulties and troubles. And yet there are few of us who will hesitate to apply to their own lot the saying, "It is good for us to be here."

With respect to the afflictions and sorrows of this life, al-

though there is much to exercise our faith, we are permitted to see and trace their actual benefits to an extent sufficient to *justify* that faith as the act of a rational being, who does not yield his assent without just and satisfactory evidence. And as to *death*, which puts a period to them all,—especially when considered in connexion with the glorious discoveries of the Gospel,—he must have a strange inaptitude for serious reflection, who fails to perceive not only that it is an essential and indispensable part of the present constitution of things, but that it could not be materially altered in many of those features which render it the object of alarm and fear and solemn awe, without diminishing its wise adaptation to the condition of man, as a pilgrim and a sojourner in this world. Though almost all may fairly say, "It is good for us to be here," there is no one who could justly say, there are very few who would choose to say, "It were good for us to remain here for ever." Our early years are, or ought to be, a period of improvement and rapid advance, and mature age the period of active and useful exertion;—but it is evident that, with a few rare exceptions, both our intellectual and our moral progress are commonly less rapid as our lives are protracted. The pleasures we once took in active pursuits gradually subsides;—there is an increasing indisposition to change; our habits both of action and of thought acquire a certain fixed and invariable character; our prejudices become, as we express it, *inveterate*. In short, there appears in all cases to be a limit beyond which we should evidently gain little or nothing personally by a longer stay in this scene of things;—a limit which does not differ very widely from the average close of our mortal existence.—If a longer life would not be useful to ourselves, still less would it be so to society at large. The evils arising from rooted prejudices in those who occupy, and would then for a longer period retain, stations of influence,—from long continued bad habits, from an increased love of the world, and the things of the world, would be greatly aggravated, and the progress of knowledge and of every kind of improvement most seriously impeded.

It appears then, that in various ways we are affected by the consequences of Adam's transgression. In the same manner our condition is often influenced by the sins of others of our fellow-creatures; conformably to the appointment of Him who for wise reasons, some of which we can without difficulty trace and comprehend, not seldom permits the sins of the parents to affect the condition of their children. These visitations are most commonly, in the first instance at least, painful and afflictive; but they are not always so even at first, and in many cases it rests with ourselves alone to render them ultimately conducive to our own benefit. They give us experience of the evils of

sin;—they may enable us to guard against the dangers into which others have fallen;—they dispose the mind to serious reflection;—they counteract temptation, they stimulate to exertion. In one or another, or all of these ways, it is not unreasonable to think that Adam's sin has been an instrument in the hands of Providence for promoting the moral education of his descendants, and for placing them not in a worse, but a better state than that which they might otherwise have attained. At all events, there is here not one word of the alleged darkening of their understandings and depravation of their moral faculties;—not the least intimation of any other *death*, or of any more formidable meaning veiled under this word, than that dissolution of the bodily frame which all mankind undergo when they cease to live in this world.

How pleasing and satisfactory is the view which these meditations give us of the ways of Divine Providence, in its dealings with rational and moral creatures!—Good, we see, is brought out of evil; and the very dispensations which were introduced as the punishment of the original offence, though occasionally harsh and rugged in their immediate aspect, become a school of moral discipline, more effective than the original condition of sinless innocence, by which souls are trained to a higher dignity and nobler achievements, and gradually ripened for the skies. 'Had Adam never fallen, shepherds and husbandmen only could have sprung from him;—now, patriots, martyrs, confessors, apostles!'

[From the Christian Reformer London, July, 1846.]

SCRIPTURE PROOFS AND SCRIPTURAL ILLUSTRATIONS OF UNITARIANISM. By John Wilson.

We owe an apology both to the author and to our readers for having allowed this valuable work to come to a third edition without giving it the honorable mention in our pages to which any publication from his pen can scarcely fail to be entitled. Mr. Wilson has attained a just distinction for the depth and minuteness of research which he has displayed, in the midst of a laborious occupation, on a subject involving a great extent and variety of reading, which might well engross the time and task the faculties of one who could devote both learning and leisure exclusively to the study.

The "Concessions of Trinitarians" is devoted to the illustration of a very remarkable feature in the controversy on this sub-

ject. As the doctrine of the Trinity can nowhere be found formally stated in any single passage of Scripture, it becomes necessary to deduce it as an inference more or less plausible, and in many cases very far-fetched and remote, and depending on a peculiar fanciful view which the individual writer takes of the relation of particular passages to the subject. The consequence of this is, that we often find the texts which are chiefly dwelt upon by one writer, disregarded or given up by another; and to such an extent has this proceeded, that there is scarcely a "proof text" in the whole Bible which has not been abandoned as untenable by eminent Trinitarian commentators. Mr. Wilson has collected specimens of this kind of concession in such number and variety, and that from orthodox writers of high name and authority, who have given their reasons for declining the use of weapons which less discerning members of their party would have put into their hands, that his volume presents a sort of magazine of Unitarian interpretations, though not a single Unitarian writer is quoted in it from beginning to end.

In the work of which the third edition, considerably enlarged and improved, is now before us, we have a more direct vindication of the same general principles, and a statement of the same arguments and interpretations emanating from the declared advocates of the doctrines and views which they have a tendency to promote. As the former treatise furnishes excellent materials in controversy, by pointing out, in almost every case that can arise, some eminent champions of orthodoxy who have repudiated it as irrelevant, so *this* has a value independent of direct controversy, by assisting the student in his endeavors to ascertain for himself whether these things are so. It presents, in a distinct and luminous arrangement, a reference to most of the scriptural arguments and evidences which are commonly considered as bearing upon this question. The interpretations are often original, and when otherwise, the author has well represented the opinions of others. After a brief tabular view, by way of introduction, of the forms of belief adopted by different Christian sects on the points involved in the Trinitarian controversy, the author distributes his subject into two parts, the first of which is entitled "Scriptural Evidence for Unitarianism," while the other is occupied by an examination of the scriptural arguments commonly alleged on the opposite side. Each part is divided into three chapters devoted to the views embraced by each party, of God, of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit. The first part may be considered as positive and dogmatic; the second, as negative and controversial. Each chapter is divided into sections, containing an enumeration of the most remarkable passages which have a bearing on some particular point of the discussion. Thus we have, first, passages of Scripture proving the strict unity of God,

— passages in which the one God is characterized as Jehovah alone,— passages in which the one God, Jehovah, is pronounced to be unequalled by any being in the universe,— passages of the New Testament in which peculiar titles, epithets or attributes, are ascribed to God, the Father, &c. Some of these are of course only specimens of the prevailing language of Scripture; in others, the enumeration is nearly, if not quite, *exhaustive;* and to each section are attached a series of observations giving a distinct and forcible statement of the author's views of their general tendency, with which for the most part we are fully disposed to coincide; and the result of the whole is such as could not fail, we think, to bring conviction to every candid and reflecting mind;— at least we should have thought so, were we not well aware of the influence exercised by early prepossessions and the general habits of thought and feeling, to bias unconsciously even many who are sincerely and earnestly bent on the search after truth.

In the list of texts (p. 11) entitled "God styled Holy One, Mighty One, &c.," it is possible that the unlearned reader might imagine that the argument depends on a stress intended to be laid on the word *One* considered as emphatic, whereas it is merely a consequence in our Translation of the peculiarity of the English language; there being nothing corresponding to it in the original, except the fact that the accompanying epithet is in the singular number, which we have no other means of representing than that which the translators have adopted. In p. 20, after adverting to the argument founded on the very few instances in which God is represented in the Old Testament as speaking in the *plural* form, the just remark is added, that there is not in Scripture a single example of the Deity being *addressed* in the plural number; which certainly might have been expected, if these occasional forms of expression had been meant to imply a plurality of nature. "The doctrine" (he continues) "that God is One, one person, one mind, one intelligent agent, is so clearly revealed in the portions of Scripture which have been cited in these sections, that it seems impossible for human language to exhibit this fundamental principle of Unitarianism in characters made resplendent with light." Without the conviction of the extensive influence of early prejudices over the best-regulated understandings, it might well be deemed astonishing that any man could peruse these forcible and sublime passages without having a strong persuasion that the dogma of a *Triune* God is the invention of speculative and erring men, unsatisfied with the noble simplicity of the Bible.

In Section 9, a tabular view is given of the various uses of the term God in the New Testament; from which it appears that this term is applied to the Supreme Being as distinguished from

Christ, 1326 times; to Christ himself, 13 times (*alleged*); to other divine messengers or to magistrates, 3 times; as an epithet of strength or excellence, 6 times; to idols or heathen deities, 13 times. But of the alleged instances of its application to Christ, it should be remembered that every one is a subject of dispute; one, a mere prophetic name; two, almost universally admitted to be false readings; two others supplied by our translators; and of the small remainder, only one (Heb. i. 8) can be admitted, our author thinks, as even probable; and in this admission we take leave to say that he goes further than we can follow him. The words appear to us to be not addressed to Christ at all, but to be said of or concerning him, the form of expression corresponding exactly to what is said *concerning* the angels in the preceding verse.* At all events, if they are addressed to Christ, they are also addressed, in the same sense, to Solomon.

In the Second Chapter, we have first a collection of the passages which prove that Jesus does *not* possess the essential attributes of Deity; and, secondly, those which prove him to be inferior to God by various titles, &c., relative to his nature, character and mission. The first section concludes with the following observations:

"Whence hath this person this wisdom, and these mighty works?' 'What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?' These are questions which in relation to our Lord seem to have perplexed some minds upwards of eighteen centuries ago; and they form at the present day one of the most interesting subjects that agitate the Christian world The Trinitarian says that Jesus Christ is the all-wise and omnipotent God, 'the second person of the Trinity, equal to the Father; 'that 'he taught in his own name, and without appealing to any authority but his own;' that 'he acted entirely by his own power, and manifested forth his own glory;' that 'though as Mediator he received the *authority* from the Father, he possessed in himself as God the *ability* by which he was enabled to exercise the authority.' The Unitarian, on the other hand, regards such language as entirely opposed to scriptural truth, and says that our Saviour did *not* represent himself as equal in power and glory to his Almighty Father — did *not* call himself the second person of the Godhead, — did not teach in his own name, — did not act by his own inherent power, — did not seek his own personal glory. And well may the Unitarian make the denials; for, as we have seen, the unerring Teacher expressly declared, that it was by the appointment and inspiration of Jehovah

* Luther's translation seems to be the most exact representation of the original. Ver. 7: *Von* den Engeln spricht er zwar, &c. Ver. 8: Aber *von* dem Sohne; Gott, deine Stuhl währet von Ewigkeit zu Ewigkeit.

he preached the gospel; that the doctrine which he taught was not his own, but His that sent him; that he had not spoken of himself, but uttered only what had been commanded him of the Father; that he was a man who told the truth which he had heard of God. Well, indeed, may the Unitarian make these denials, and affirm that the Lord and Master of Christians derived all his knowledge and power from the Source of wisdom and inspiration; for, as has been proved, the holy being who had been intrusted by his Father, for the best and most benevolent of purposes, with a control over the laws of nature, was in the habit of addressing in prayer Almighty God, and of characterizing himself as a docile and obedient Son who receives all his instructions from his Father, and whose filial piety is so strong, so affectionate, that he does nothing and can do nothing but what he is permitted by his beloved Parent to perform. And while Jesus attributed to the Father who dwelt within him the wisdom and the power which were so conspicuous in his doctrine and in his miracles, he never at any time disclosed the cabalistic view of his person, that he thus spoke and acted in the lowest and most insignificant of his capacities, — viz. in his human nature, — at the very time when, according to the same system, he possessed also an infinite nature, capable, without the aid of the Father, of revealing the most important truths, and performing the most astonishing works!

"May we not, therefore, without subterfuge or equivocation, say with the apostle Paul, that THE HEAD OF CHRIST IS GOD?" — P. 74.

[From the Christian Reformer, London, July, 1846.]

LEARNING OF THE CLERGY

IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

SIR,

MY time has of late been a good deal occupied in perusing the Manuscripts which are contained in Dr. Williams's Library. I have, in the course of my examination of them, met with several curious and interesting documents, particularly one entitled "A true Copy of Bishop Hooper's Visitation Booke, made by him A. D. 1551, 1552." In the hope that a few extracts from the Bishop's Visitation Booke may be interesting to some portion of your readers, I will, with your leave, occupy a page or two of the Christian Reformer upon the subject. "Hooper, John, was born in Somersetshire in 1495, and educated in Merton College, Oxford. He was for some time a member of the order

of the Cistercians, but having imbibed the principles of the Reformers, he quitted a monastic life, and went to Switzerland, where he was married. On the accession of Edward VI., he returned to England, and was made Bishop of Gloucester, to which was added the Bishopric of Worcester in commendam. Here he labored with great zeal till the Restoration of Popery under Mary. Bishop Hooper was now thrown into prison, whither the good old Latimer also was sent soon after. Here he was exceedingly ill-treated, underwent a mock trial, and was condemned to the flames through the means of the infamous Gardiner." * The account of the torture he endured is too horrible to relate; suffice it to say that the diabolical act was perpetrated in the year 1555.

The Bishop's Visitation Booke begins with his letter to the Clergy of his Diocese, printed in the Appendix to Strype's Cranmer, p. 135. Then follow "Articles concerning Christian Religion, given by the Reverend Father in Christ, John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, unto all the singular Deanes, Parsons, Prebends, Vicars, Curates, and other Ecclesiasticall Ministers within the Dioces of Gloucester, to be had and retained of them, for the Unity and Agreement as well for the Doctrine of God's Word, as also for the Conformity of the Ceremonies agreeing with God's Word."

The Articles are fifty in number, and are principally directed against Popish ceremonies.

Article 27. No man ought to receive the Communion of the body and bloud of our Lord for another, neither yet one for many, but every man for himselfe, ffor no more dothe the Communion prevaile, being take of one for another, then doth Babtisme. Wherefore the Communion ought not to be kept or celebrated within the Church, unlesse that the whole Congregation (or at least a good part of the same) do receive it.

Article 28. That such doctrines doth plainly approve that the Popish Mass is a mere enemy against God's word and Christ's institution. And albeit it doth retaine in it certain lessons of the Holy Scriptures, yet it is nothing better to be esteemed then the verses of the sorcerer or inchanter, that be nothing the more to be esteemed for certaine holy words murmured and spoaken in seacret.

Next to the Articles follow "Injunctions given by John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, in his Visitation in the Yeare of our Lord God a Thousand Five Hundreth Forty-and-one, and in the Fifth Yeare of the Reigne of our Soveraigne Lord, King

---

* Vide Rees's Cyclopædia.

Edward the Sixte, to be observed and kept of all Parsons, Vicars, Curates and Ministers within the Dioces of Gloucester." The Injunctions are thirty-one in number.

First. That they nor none of them teach, upon the paines of God's displeasure and the King's, any other doctrine, faith, prayer or religion unto the people necessary for salvation, then such as they can duely, justly and manifestly prove out of the Word of God.

The Injunctions as well as the Articles contain bold attacks upon the Popish Mass.

15 Item. That ye be diligent and carefull yourselves, and also exhort the Church Proctors and Wardens, with all other that be appointed for the continuance and preservation of true religion and godly conversation in your parishes among the people,—that no man nor woman maintaine openly or privately by talking, reading, preaching, disputation, argument, or other reasoning, the defence of Transubstantion of the bread and wine in the Sacrament of Christ's pretious body and bloud, any corporall, fleshly, bodily or reall presence of Christ's body in the Sacrament, any use or necessity of Masses, Prayers unto Saints, Purgatory, Pardons, Indulgence, Beades, Images, or such other Superstition as is most justly condemned by God's Word and the King's Majestie's authority.

Then follow "Interrogatories and Demands of the People or Parishioners and their Conversation, to be required and known by the Parsons, Vicars and Curates." The Interrogatories are twenty-eight in number.

First. Whether they be diligent, willing and glad to hear and learne the Commandments of God, the Articles of the Christian Faith, and the Lord's Prayer, called the Pater Noster?

15 Item. Whether any man do occupie any such Primers, or Bookes of Prayers in Latin, as be forbidden by the Lawes of the Realme, or any Beades, Knotts, Reliques, or any such other Superstition; or whether any man pray in the Church his private and own Prayer, whiles the Common Prayer is a saying, to the trouble or hinderance of the understanding thereof?

Next are "Interrogatories and Examinations of the Ministers and of their Conversation, to be required and known by the Parishioners."

First. Whether your Minister be Parson, Vicar or Curate, and how long he hath been so?

2 Item. If he be a Parson or Vicar, whether he be resident or not; and if he be not resident, what is the cause he is not resident; and whether he have left for him in his absence a sufficient and lawfull Minister to discharge his cure?

3 Item. Whether all such images as heretofore hath been in the temple, be burned and destroyed?

These Interrogatories are sixty-one in number, and shew the determined hostility of the Bishop to Popish ceremonies, and his anxious desire to remove them from the Church. We cannot wonder that so formidable an enemy of Popery should have been among the first marked out for destruction, as soon as the Catholic faith was again triumphant. Such, however, was his attachment to the principles of the Reformers, that though the Queen's pardon was set before him if he would recant his opinion, he cheerfully endured the most cruel torture, and manifested a fortitude almost incredible, till death released him from his agony. The Visitation Booke concludes with an Examination of the Clergy of the Diocese of Gloucester in the *Ten Commandments*, the *Articles of Faith*, and the *Lord's Prayer*. The number of clergymen examined was about 340; and I will now give your readers an instance or two of the *biblical knowledge* of some of these worthies.

The articles in which all Ministers have been examined, viz.. concerning the Commandments delivered by God to Moses in Exod. xx., concerning the Articles of Belief, and the Lord's Prayer.

Of the Ten Commandments.

Quest. 1. How many are the Commandments of God?
2. Where are they recorded?
3. Are they able to repeat them from memory?*

Of the Articles of Belief.

Quest. 1. What are the Articles of the Christian faith?
2. Whether they can repeat them from memory?
3. Whether they are able to maintain them on Scriptural authority?

---

* The record is altogether in *Latin*, which we translate. As a specimen of the Latinity, we give a few lines of the original.

De Decem Præceptis.

Questiones. 1. Primo, Quot sunt Dei mandata?
2. Secundo, Ubinam sunt scripta?
3. Tertio, An memoriter recitare valeant?

Johannes Jones, Minister, examinatus de Præceptis dicit quod decem sunt numero, sed ubi scripta, nescit, nec recitare memoriter valet.

Of the Lord's Prayer.

Quest. 1. Are they able to repeat the Lord's Prayer from memory?
2. How they know that it is *the Lord's* Prayer?
3. Where is it recorded?

Of the Commandments.

John Jones, Minister, being examined concerning the Commandments, says that they are ten in number, but does not know where they are recorded, nor is able to repeat them from memory.

Of the Articles of Belief.

He knows, however, the Articles of Belief, and can repeat them from memory, but is unable to maintain them by Scripture proofs.

Of the Lord's Prayer.

He is able to repeat the Lord's Prayer from memory, *but does not know by whom it was delivered nor where recorded.*

Of the Commandments.

Richard Ramscoat, Vicar, being examined concerning the Commandments, said they are ten in number, that they are recorded in the xx. chapter of Exodus, but cannot repeat them from memory exactly as they are there recorded.

Of the Articles of Belief.

He knows, however, the Articles of Belief, and repeated them from memory, but is unable to prove them by the Authority of Scripture.

Of the Lord's Prayer.

He is able to repeat the Lord's Prayer from memory, says that it is recorded in the vi. chapter of Matthew, but is utterly ignorant by whom it was delivered.

Of the Commandments.

Thomas Astell, Minister, being examined concerning the Commandments, says that they are ten in number, that they are recorded in *the New Testament,* but does not know where, nor is he able to repeat them correctly from memory.

Of the Articles of Belief.

He knows, however, the Articles of Faith, and repeated them from memory, but is unable to maintain them on the authority of Scripture.

Of the Lord's Prayer.

He is able to repeat the Lord's Prayer from memory, but does not know by whom it was delivered, or where recorded.

Of the Commandments.

John Lawrence, Rector, being examined concerning the Commandments, says that they are ten in number, that they are recorded in the xx. chapter of Exodus, and is able to repeat them exactly as they are there contained.

Of the Articles of Belief.

He also knows the Articles of Belief, and is able to repeat them from memory, but cannot prove them by the authority of Scripture.

Of the Lord's Prayer.

He is able to repeat the Lord's prayer from memory, but knows not by whom it was delivered or where recorded.

Of the Commandments.

Nicholas Compton, Vicar, examined concerning the Commandments; he knew the number, but says that they are written in the *sixteenth of Matthew*, or *in some of the Evangelists;* and he is not able to say them by heart.

Of the Articles of Belief.

He knew also the Articles of Belief, and repeated the same from memory, but he did not even prove one by the authority of the Scriptures.

Of the Lord's Prayer.

With respect to the Lord's Prayer, he is scarcely able to answer.

Of the Commandments.

Robert Heyet, Minister, examined concerning the Commandments; he neither knew the number nor the place where they were written, nor is he able to recite them from memory in any way.

Of the Articles of Belief.

He knew not also the Articles of Belief, nor is he able to recite the same from memory, or to prove them by the authority of the Scriptures.

Of the Lord's Prayer.

He is not able to recite from memory the Lord's Prayer; he knew not even by whom it was delivered, or by whom it was written.

The name of the parish church where the clergymen officiated is given, and also the number of communicants, varying from 9 to 1500. Having introduced to your readers some of the *unlearned*, I will now give an instance or two of the more *learned* answers.

Of the Commandments.

John Jones, Minister, being examined concerning the Commandments, says that they are ten in number, that they are recorded in the xx. chap. of Exodus, and is able to repeat them from memory exactly as they are contained in Exodus.

Of the Articles of Belief.

He also knows the Articles of Belief, and is able to repeat them from memory, but is unable to maintain them directly by Scripture proofs.

Of the Lord's Prayer.

He repeated from memory the Lord's Prayer, and knows that it is the Lord's Prayer, because it was delivered by Christ to his apostles, and was recorded in Matt. vi.

Of the Commandments, the Articles of Belief, and The Lord's Prayer.

John Williams, Vicar, being examined, is found to be a remarkably learned man, and gives learned replies to all the articles mentioned above.

Of the Commandments.

Christopher Woodward, Rector, being examined concerning the Commandments, says that they are ten in number, that they are recorded in the xx. chap. of Exodus, and repeated them from memory exactly as they are therein contained.

Of the Articles of Belief.

He also knows the Articles of Belief, and is able to repeat them from memory, and can prove them immediately by the authority of Scripture.

Of the Lord's Prayer.

He repeated from memory the Lord's Prayer, and knows that it is the Lord's Prayer, because it was delivered by Christ to his disciples, and was recorded in the vi. chap. of Matthew.

I will not fatigue your readers with any further extracts. A sufficient number have been produced to shew the extreme ignorance of many of the clergy in the days of Bishop Hooper; and if such ignorance existed in the diocese of Gloucester, where there was so enlightened a Bishop, what must have been the state of the clergy in other parts? It is rather a singular fact, that nearly all * the 340 clergymen examined knew the Articles

---

* There are a few instances like the following:

Concerning the Commandments, Articles of Faith, and the Lord's Prayer.—

of Faith, but not above twenty could produce what was considered *Scripture authority* for the same, — a sufficient proof that if they searched the Scriptures for that purpose, they searched them in vain.

R. COGAN.

WHAT ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY SHOULD BE.

CHRISTIANITY is a religion for the masses, and we demur to a professed history of Christianity which leaves its effects upon the masses untold. We would learn how, in other times and among other people, the religion with whose ordinary effects among ourselves we are conversant, has been received, and has operated among the community at large. We would know what it has done for the peasant in his cottage, for the artificer at his loom, for the matron amid her children, as well as what it has achieved or suffered in palaces, cathedrals and colleges. We would gaze on the stream as it steals through the green fields and by the happy homes of poor men, as well as when it dashes down the rocky fall, or expands in artificial beauty in the lordly park. We would, in short, have the historian of Christ's religion to remember, that it is part of his proper province to chronicle the effects and manifestations of that religion, not only among the few noble and mighty and wise by whom it is embraced, but as they appear in those retired scenes of domestic life where Christ himself delighted to be, and amongst that class of the community who, in the days of his flesh, were the first and readiest to "hear him gladly."— *British Quarterly Review*, No. III. p. 85.

Richard Shessard, Vicar, examined concerning the Articles above mentioned, is found a man altogether ignorant.

John Shearche, Rector, examined and is found a man ignorant above the rest.

Christopher Horton, Minister, examined, and is found a man ignorant above all the rest, for he is able to answer nothing directly.

THE

UNITARIAN.

[From the Inquirer, London, July, 1846.]

THE EDUCATION QUESTION—DR. HOOK'S PAMPHLET.

Dr. Hook, the well-known Vicar of Leeds, a High-Churchman and Puseyite, in which characters he is anything but an object of admiration to us, but we believe a sincere and benevolent man, who conscientiously carries out his principles, has published his views on Education, in a pamphlet so remarkable, that it could not fail to attract general notice; and we have only abstained from calling attention to it earlier, in order to pronounce upon it a deliberate opinion. That Dr. Hook advances very liberal opinions for one of his class—that his concessions are, at the present crisis, very important, and are the sign of a great progress of public opinion—can hardly, we think, be doubted; nor will many refuse to his pamphlet the praise of being able, earnest, and eloquent, so as to be well fitted to exercise all the influence, whether for good or evil, which his position or his arguments may dispose men to allow him. We must confess, however, that we are far from thinking, with our able contemporary the Morning Chronicle, that Dr. Hook has succeeded in

removing by his proposals the chief difficulties in the way of a plan of national education. The primary question is, whether education is at all an affair falling within the province of Government; and although some of our friends be disposed to censure severely those who would entertain this question, it seems to us to demand the most careful attention. The conclusion which satisfies us at present is, that the State ought to assist in providing the means of education, so as to ensure no part of the population being destitute of them; but that for the State to take upon itself the whole business, and assume a systematic control, would be attended with a great preponderance of evil. Now the latter plan is what Dr. Hook contemplates, and that so completely, that the tendency of his system would be to absorb all private schools of all classes, and to bring all under common regulations. If schools for the poor ought to be all formed on a model, and all under common control, so we think ought those for the wealthier classes. That some interference may be necessary in both cases, to prevent quackery, fraud, and tyranny, may be conceded. Undoubtedly, active interference is wanted to ensure the faithful and wise application of the enormous funds left for education by the liberality of former generations, and this is absolutely necessary in concurrence with the appropriation of any additional funds. It has lately been proposed too, and with great plausibility, though such plans require much deliberation, that a college of schoolmasters should be authorized, like the medical institutions, to give their sanction, after examination, to those whom they shall find competent to their work; and even that it shall be made an offence to practise the profession of a schoolmaster without that sanction, or an equivalent for it in university degrees. This is intended to ensure the qualifications of the educator, so as both to elevate his position, and guard the public against deception; but it would require a classification of schools, and different exami-

nations adapted to the different classes, and the provisions ought, if desirable at all, to extend to female as well as male education. With respect to direct Government interference to provide schools, we feel that an extraordinary deficiency existing in the means for education demands a remedy; that the evils of ignorance and early neglect can by no wise government be suffered to exist; and yet that the absorption of all private schools into public ones, on a uniform plan, would be a serious disadvantage. We are ready then to call upon Government carefully to inspect the whole country, to ascertain the extent of deficiency in the means of education, and to supply it either by aiding the extension of good schools already existing, or by establishing new ones as they may be needed; seeing that they are supplied with well-trained teachers. It would also be a great benefit to provide good schools expressly for the training of teachers, by which a sufficient supply of highly-qualified male and female instructors should be prepared for the gradual supply of schools throughout the country.

In a country divided in religious opinion, the grand difficulty in the way of all plans for extending education is, to avoid injustice to sections of the community, and to prevent the interference of sectarian jealousy or rivalship. If State-schools are connected with one church — an established one — all the injustice which is involved in the attempt to elevate one sect, by State patronage, is aggravated and multiplied by extending the system to education also. We need not now speak of the merits of such a plan, for no one would, in the present state of opinion, have the hardihood to propose it; and if proposed, it would arouse a degree of public indignation that would inevitably stifle it in the bud. This scheme being rejected, the only others are, either to teach in the schools so much religion, and no more, as is common to all, or to omit, in the national schools, all teaching of religion, leaving it to be provided for by

other methods. The former is the plan of the British schools. The idea is, that from the reading of the scriptures, and the lessons of practical morality and regard to religion, much good will arise to all the children; whilst in Sunday-schools, and under the care of parents, friends, and religious teachers, it may be ensured that such additional instruction as is required will be obtained. The objections to this plan are, that the master and visitors can with difficulty be brought to abstain from giving, in the way of commentary on what is read, their own doctrinal opinions, so as to make the schools seem dangerous to those who disapprove them; and that it seems as if schools thus conducted especially favored those whose religious opinions are the simplest, — that is most nearly the residuum of religion, when peculiar sectarian opinions are omitted, and this creates offence and alarm among the more orthodox sects. The plan was the one which first presented itself for harmonious union, and it has many recommendations, and has in many places worked well; but it must be acknowledged, that it cannot quite satisfy the zealots of any party, and was pretty sure to lead to the very abuses which are now causing such animated discussion. The remaining plan is free from most of the objections made to this, and is, we believe, on the whole, to be preferred; but it is objected, that it has the appearance of undervaluing religion, in not specially providing for it; and that there is a danger of its practically leading to the neglect of this, the most important of all subjects of instruction. As to the vulgar abuse of *godless* systems of education, and the accusations against the advocates of this plan, as intending to bring religion into neglect, they are unworthy of the least attention. It is a simple fact, that in our community men differ greatly in their religious opinions. No just man believes himself to have a right to force the opinions of others, or to punish them directly or indirectly for their faith; but it is obviously desirable that the members of one

political society, though differing in faith, should be able to live together harmoniously, and act together in civil affairs. Hence it is desirable that they should *be educated together.* It is admitted that religion is of supreme importance, and that attention to it ought to be encouraged to the utmost, and every possible facility afforded impartially to all. It is only denied that the State ought to favor one religion more than another, or to do anything for the one which would be offensive to the others. A principal peculiarity of Dr. Hook's plan is, the manner in which he attempts to get over the difficulty about the supposed neglect of religion in this plan, which he acknowledges to be, on the whole, the best. He would not merely afford encouragement and facilities, he would enforce attendance on Sunday-schools, and on other occasions, for receiving religious instruction; and make the weekly production of a certificate of receiving such instruction an essential for continuance in the school. This, however, is by no means unobjectionable, for it is much to be feared that there is a large class in this country at present who have, and profess to have, *no religion*, and who would refuse any assistance in education for their children which compelled them to profess to have any, or to make any choice amongst those prevalent. Such persons may be conscientious; they may also be obstinate. We have no right whatever to force religion upon them, and we should do a great public injury in withholding education from them. Give them education, and we believe they would, at no distant time, learn to value religion; but it is both injuring them, and injuring the rest of society, to leave them neglected and untrained, because we have to lament that, through their parents' error, their state is already peculiarly pitiable. Other things in the details of Dr. Hook's plan may be liable to considerable objection. It is clear to us that such a plan cannot be adopted; and if the present Government are determined to attempt settling this great and

much agitated question, they will require great caution, and the utmost care to avoid causes of offence; but we rejoice to think Dr. Hook's pamphlet affords indications favorable to their object, and that it is likely, on the whole, to promote agreement amidst the contending parties.

[From the Unitarian, (London) August, 1846.]

THOUGHTS ON THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

The results of the reflections suggested by our examination of the Scriptural account of man's first disobedience, has been, if I mistake not, to show that it furnishes a very inadequate foundation for the enormous and appalling structure which has been erected upon it. From this narrative we have no authority to suppose that Adam's nature was thenceforth corrupted and debased, so as to become altogether depraved and sinful. Still less are we told that this sinful nature was transmitted to the remotest generations of his posterity. Not a word do we find from which we should be led to suspect that all mankind are the objects of punishment for Adam's sin, "that they have lost communion with God, and are justly liable to his wrath and curse forever." If it be admitted that all mankind are personally affected by the consequences of this transgression, and especially that we have been thereby subjected to the dominion and the fear of death,)though it should not be overlooked, that not even this is to be collected from the history as given by Moses, when taken by itself), there is reason to believe that these consequences, as far as we are concerned, are no marks of God's wrath and displeasure, but are rather proofs of his love; inasmuch as they are necessary parts of a salutary, though, perhaps, in some instances, a sterner and more forbidding discipline, by which our moral natures may be raised to a higher standard, and which has a tendency, unless counteracted by our own folly, to place us in a state not perhaps so inviting, but more really conducive to our moral progress and substantial happiness than that of our first parents.

Such is the conclusion which we seem to be authorized to deduce from our general reasonings and principles, when taken in connection with the narrative of this first transgression in the book of Genesis. But it may perhaps be said, "though nothing

more can be inferred from this passage, there are many texts in other parts of the Bible from whence the deficiency may be supplied, in which the received doctrine is more distinctly and fully expressed." Why, so we might naturally suppose; and I have no doubt that those who are contented to receive without examination the vague and random statements of controversial writers and preachers, very commonly believe it to be the case. The fact, however, is so completely the reverse, that there are but *two* passages in the whole Bible where the consequences of Adam's sin considered as affecting the condition of his posterity are even alluded to. Both of these occur in the writings of St. Paul; but when rightly understood, will not be found to teach anything more than what is very seldom disputed, and what I at least am by no means disposed to call in question — namely, that as a consequence of the sin of our first progenitor, death (meaning by that term the dissolution of these mortal frames at the termination of our present state of existence) came upon all mankind.

One of these texts can give us no trouble, because the thing is obvious. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead; for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." * These words evidently imply (they do not absolutely *affirm* even this, but they imply) nothing more than that by Adam's sin he and his posterity were subjected to that death which might never have been followed by a revival, had not God provided that mankind should be made alive again at the last day, by that dispensation which is made known to us through Christ, and assured to us by his death and resurrection.

The other passage is found in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, from the twelfth to the nineteenth verse. It cannot be denied that this is an obscure and difficult passage; though it seems to me that our admitting the doctrine commonly supposed to be taught in it has no tendency to render it less so. The obscurity arises partly from the Apostle's very peculiar style, and partly from his use of certain Hebrew forms of speech, with which we are less familiar. I may add, that our translators in the authorized version might almost be thought to have studiously made it still more puzzling, by adopting, in several instances, an awkward, involved, and hardly English form of construction.† I will subjoin the entire paragraph from Mr. Wakefield's translation, which appears to me on the whole the most correct; and an attentive perusal may perhaps enable the reader to judge whether the words of the Apostle appear to imply any *other* con-

---

* 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22.

† See particularly the 15th and 16th verses.

sequence as resulting to us from Adam's sin, than that undisputed one of death, to which all men are liable.

"[12] So then as through one man sin came into the world, and *death* through sin, thus also death passed over to all mankind, because all sinned.* ([13] For sin was in the world all the time before the law; and though sin is not charged where there is no law, [14] yet *death* reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression, who is a pattern of him that was to come.) [15] But the kindness was not like the sin; for if by the sin of one all men *died*.† much more hath the gracious gift of God, by the kindness of one man Jesus Christ, abounded unto all. [16] And this gift was not as in the case of that single sin;‡ for the sentence followed one sin unto *condemnation;* but the gracious gift followed many sins unto acquittal. [17] For if *death* reigned through the sin of one man, much more will they who receive the abundantly gracious gift of this acquittal reign in life through that one, Jesus Christ. [18] As then by one sin, all came into *condemnation*, so also by one kindness all men came into a deliverance of life. [19] For as by the disobedience of one man all *became as sinners*, so likewise, by the obedience of one, all will be constituted righteous."

It appears to me evident that the Apostle is here speaking of that death which entered into the world by Adam's sin, and is common to all mankind, and of that restoration to life which is in like manner made known unto all men by Jesus Christ. The only part of the passage which seems to imply anything more is the last verse; which however is only a continuation of the parallel the writer had been carrying on between the offence of one man, and the righteousness or obedience of another man, and their respective consequences. Hence when *the* many or *all* are said to be made, or constituted sinners, we are to understand it in the same sense as the judgment passed upon all mentioned in the preceding verse. The two verses are thus paraphrased by Dr. Priestley: "*as* therefore all men suffer death for the offence of one man, *so* all receive life in consequence of the obedience of another man; for *as* in consequence of the disobedience of

---

* Dr. John Taylor translates the words somewhat more literally, "And so death passed upon all men, unto which all have sinned;"—explaining them thus, "Death passed upon all men, as far even as which all men were constituted sinners, or were treated as sinners; that is to say, all men became sufferers to this extent in consequence of Adam's one offence." For the grounds of this explanation see more particularly the remarks on the nineteenth verse.

† [οἱ πολλοι,] *the many;* the great mass of mankind.

‡ Mr. Wakefield here follows a reading which is placed in his margin by Griesbach as one deserving of notice, though not admitted into his text.

one man, all were treated as if they had been sinners, *so* in consequence of the obedience of another man, they are treated as if they had been righteous; — the former sentence of death being reversed, and all being raised to immortal life." The expression "were made sinners" corresponds to that which occurs 2 Cor. verse 21, where Christ, who knew no sin, is said to have been *made sin* for us — that is, was condemned, treated as though he had been a sinner. It is a Hebrew form of speech, of which there are many examples in the Old Testament. Thus Psalm xxxvii. 33.— "The Lord will not leave him in his hand, nor *condemn him* when he is judged."—(Literally, nor make him a sinner.) Again, Proverbs, xvii. 15.—"He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth (literally, maketh a sinner) the just, even they both are an abomination to the Lord."

We feel ourselves authorized therefore to conclude, that when the Apostle uses the expression "by one man's disobedience many were made sinners," he means simply that in consequence of Adam's offence, the many, that is, mankind at large, were made subject to death, by the judgment or express appointment of God. On the other hand, when the many were made righteous through the obedience of one man, Jesus Christ, it pleased God to make him the instrument of the reversal of that sentence whereby death had passed upon all men, announcing through his gospel the restoration to life at the general resurrection, and not only so, but mercies and gifts, privileges and advantages both here and hereafter, far exceeding and counterbalancing any evils we may be subject to in consequence of the first transgression.

We have already adverted to various considerations tending to show that this sentence of condemnation, the appointments which constituted the punishment of the first sin, being made to affect all succeeding generations, are in many respects only blessings in disguise. "It is just as if a father," (I use the ingenious, but very just and appropriate illustration of an excellent writer upon this question, Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich), "for some irregularities in his first child, should determine to lay a restraint upon him, either in diet, dress or diversions; and at the same time should judge it expedient to make it a rule with all the other children he might afterwards have. In this instance it is easy to see how the 'judgment to condemnation' pronounced on the offence of the first-born, cometh upon the other children, even before they are brought into the world, without any injustice, nay perhaps with a great deal of kindness on the father's part. Upon the first it is a proper punishment; on the rest it cometh as wholesome discipline. And yet, through the offence of one, they are debarred from some pleasures or enjoyments. By the offence of one, the judgment to condemnation cometh upon all the rest—by one child's offence restraint reigneth; and

by one child's disobedience the many that come after him are made sinners or sufferers; inasmuch as they are deprived of some indulgences which might have given them pleasure, but which their father saw, everything considered, would not be for their good."

I am far from pretending that I have removed all the difficulties in this passage; undoubtedly it is a very intricate and obscure passage. But it is enough for my present purpose if I have shown that, whatever may have been the writer's full and entire meaning, nothing like the commonly received doctrine of original sin can be collected from it. Here is nothing said of the public character of Adam as the representative or "federal head" of mankind; nothing of the imputation of his offence to his descendants; nothing of the alleged total debasement or corruption of their natures as the consequence of his transgression; nothing of their being wholly inclined to all evil and that continually; nothing, in fine, of any other evil resulting to us from Adam's sin, except the appointment of *death* as the instrument of our removal from the present scene of things. And even this the Apostle mentions, not for the purpose of dwelling upon it as a punishment inflicted upon *us* for the sin of our first parents (an idea which I am persuaded never entered into his imagination), but to show that it is, as we have just observed, a blessing in disguise; whatever pain or affliction attends it being far outweighed and altogether lost in the surpassing excellence and glory of that restoration for which it prepares the way to a more desirable state of existence, the expectation of which we enjoy through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Now these two are, as I have already said, the only two places in the whole Bible where the sin of Adam is spoken of as affecting the condition of his descendants. It is granted that there are in addition to these, various other texts which are frequently cited in support of this doctrine; but they appear to me to have very little to do with the subject; being for the most part merely strong descriptions of the great depravity of some individual, or of the general spread of wickedness among numerous bodies of men; lamentable facts which no one denies; but which may be accounted for by the unhappy influence of perverse education, bad example, and temptations addressed to craving appetites and uncontrolled passions. One of the texts most frequently referred to is Psalm li. 5. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me;" (or rather, in sin did my mother *cherish* me.) This is manifestly the strong language of contrition and self-abasement. The Psalm was probably composed, as the title imports, shortly after those heinous crimes which constitute the great blot in the history of David; when he had been awakened to deep feelings of remorse, and a suitable conviction

of his sin by the visit of Nathan the prophet. He is deeply affected by a painful sense of the enormity of his crime, and expresses it in terms which can scarcely have been meant to be taken literally, but the purport of which evidently is, that his depravity could not have been greater if he had been originally shapen in iniquity, and made capable of nothing else. But that it has nothing to do with original sin is evident when we consider that there is not one word about Adam or the effect of his sin upon us, and moreover that the Psalmist is confessing, lamenting, and describing in strong terms his own personal wickedness, of which these words, in the way that some understand them, would be rather a plea in palliation; but this is clearly far from his intention.

Another text much relied upon is Ephesians ii. 3. "—And were by nature children of wrath, even as others." Such is the form in which you find this text commonly cited by controversial writers. It is, you perceive, not even a complete sentence, but a detached clause, separated from its connexion, without anything to inform us to whom it is intended to apply, or under what circumstances and limitations. If we read from the beginning of the chapter, we find that the Apostle is addressing his Gentile converts, and comparing their present condition, being admitted to a knowledge of the grace and mercy of God in Christ Jesus, with that in which their unbelieving neighbors still were, and in which they had partaken with them aforetime, "when they walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience. Among whom," he continues (identifying himself, according to his frequent practice, with his Gentile brethren), "we all had our conversation in times past, in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others."

The phrase "by nature" seems here to denote *originally*, or previous to our conversion; as when the Apostle elsewhere speaks of*

---

* Romans ii. 14. Here the Apostle evidently refers, not to anything born with them, or existing independently of education and experience, but in the absence of any divine revelation, by the influence of those pure or benevolent sentiments which the circumstances they had been placed in had a natural tendency to generate. It is curious to observe the contradictory position in which the ordinary mode of interpretation places these two passages. If in the one, we were *born* children of wrath, in the other, some at least were *born* disposed to do the things contained in the law. It is our belief that we are not born either in one state or the other. But one thing at least is obvious, that in the latter text St. Paul distinctly admits it to be *possible*, that by the unassisted impulses of their own nature and reason, men might arrive at a knowledge of rectitude and virtue, and might even be influenced by suitable motives to a correspondent practice to such an extent as to make them fit objects of acceptance in the sight of God.

the Gentiles as doing by nature the things contained in the law; and compares them to branches of an olive-tree wild by nature, grafted contrary to nature into a good olive-tree; contrasting the state in which they had been as heathens with the change wrought upon them by their reception of the covenant of grace. The term *wrath*, when used with reference to the Divine Being and his dealings with his sinful creatures, has acquired in our language, partly perhaps in consequence of its frequent use in theological controversy, a stronger and harsher meaning than the original word will authorize. As commonly used at present, it seems to express, not the calm and dignified displeasure with which it may be supposed that a Being of unspotted holiness will regard the pollution and misery of sin, but a vehement and furious passion, hardly consistent with the ideas we naturally form of absolute purity and perfection. Our notions of the Divine character and attributes are doubtless obtained in the first instance, by transferring to the Deity whatever conceptions of moral excellence we have derived from intercourse with the best of our fellow-creatures, carried forward to the highest conceivable perfection, and purified from all that admixture of human frailty, weakness and vice, to which even the best of mankind are liable. But in this instance, we seem to ascribe to our heavenly Father not the virtues, but the infirmities, the violent emotions and malignant passions incident to human nature. The original word (οργη) is the same which is used (Mark iii. 5.) where our Saviour is said to look round on the Pharisees "with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts." This mixture of indignant displeasure at their depravity with a deep and tender compassion for its unhappy results, aptly displays in the person of Christ, the sentiments which it becomes us to ascribe to his God and Father, of whom he is to us the image and representative. Even in this sense of the word, I doubt whether any other passage can be found to encourage the notion that the heathens, while wandering in ignorance and darkness, are represented in Scripture as objects of the wrath of God. On the contrary, though they knew not Him, He was ever actuated by love and pity towards his erring guilty children. "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, not to condemn the world, but that the world, through him, might be saved." In this very passage, the Apostle proceeds in language which directly contradicts and disproves the supposition. God is so far from being filled with wrath towards them, that He is "rich in mercy, and for His great goodness wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in trespasses and sins, hath quickened us together with Jesus Christ." Hence, it seems most probable, that in the present instance, the term "children of wrath," denotes not any sentiment ascribed to God, but an excessive, ill-governed passion

in the breast of the sinner. As "children of disobedience" in the preceding verse evidently signifies "guilty of disobedience," so "children of wrath" seems naturally to denote, "addicted to wrath." Such excessive anger and resentment was a natural consequence of the habits which he describes as prevailing among those who walked in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires and devices of the flesh and of the mind; that is, giving way to the uncontrolled impulses of passions not under the guidance of reason, and aggravated by disorderly and intemperate habits. In conformity with this interpretation of the text, we find both in this epistle and that to the Colossians, which was written at the same time and bears a close analogy to it, repeated admonitions on this very subject, which lead us to suppose St. Paul had particular reasons for thinking that such admonitions were more especially wanted among his converts in those places. "Be ye angry and sin not; let not the sun go down upon your wrath." "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil-speaking, with all malice, be put away far from you," &c. The true meaning, therefore, of the Apostle's words seems to be, "and we were originally, that is, before we embraced the Gospel, addicted to wrath, and other violent and bad passions, even as others." *

It seems to me that it would be almost a superfluous labor to enter into a more particular and minute examination of other texts which have been cited in the same manner with those I have already mentioned, as affording some sort of countenance directly or indirectly to this doctrine. Not that they are after all very numerous, even when selected from all parts of Scripture, separated from their connexion, and arrayed together in one catalogue for the purpose of making a stronger impression, according to the practice too common with theological writers of all parties. With respect to all of them the general remark we have already made may be repeated, that they are evidently intended merely as descriptions in lively and forcible (most commonly poetical) language, of the actual wickedness which has prevailed in particular ages and countries, but have no reference whatever to this or to any other doctrine respecting the causes to which this lamentable fact is to be ascribed.

Of one text, on which as much stress has been laid as on any other, "What is man, that he should be clean, and he that is

---

* The same form of expression frequently occurs in the Old Testament: — "Are ye not children of transgression?" Isaiah lvii. 4. "And shall devour the crown of the head of the tumultuous ones," (literally children of noise.) Jer. xlviii. 45. "Children of iniquity." Hosea x. 9. "Sons of valor." 2 Chron. xxviii. 6. "Sons of affliction." Prov. xxxi. 5, &c.

born of a woman, that he should be righteous?" &c. (Job xv. 14), it has been well observed, * that the words are found in the Bible it is true, but are not on that account to be received as the expression of Divine truth, being merely exaggerated representations of human infirmity made by Eliphaz, the Temanite, which provoked even the patient Job to reply, "Miserable comforters are ye all — ye are all forgers of lies. O that ye would altogether hold your peace, and it should be your wisdom." The folly of this mode of quoting Scripture surely needs not be exposed. There are no tenets so opposite and contradictory, but that in this manner an apparent support could be obtained for them in language professing to form a part of the revealed word of God.

With respect to those quotations which are not liable to this decisive objection, it may be remarked, that they must at least be understood in such a sense as to be consistent, not only with other parts of holy writ, but with other declarations of the same writer. When, for example, we find such strong expressions used by the Psalmist as that which has already been considered, we must not forget that it is the same person who elsewhere declares, "I have set the Lord always before me;"— who appeals to God for the rectitude of his intentions and conduct in such terms as these, "Judge me, O God, for I have walked in my integrity." If from one psalm we may pick out such words as these, "they are altogether become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no not one," and if, regardless of their connexion and true application, some are not slow to represent them as expressing the doctrine that man is "utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually,"— we find multitudes of places in the same book, which speak of the righteous, the holy, the upright— "Mark the perfect man and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace;"— "shout for joy, all ye that are upright;"— "all the upright in heart shall glory:"—"the righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance;"—"rejoicing is in the tabernacle of the righteous;" &c.

Will it be objected that to dwell in this manner upon such apparent contradictions, is to represent the word of God as abounding in inconsistencies, and as furnishing materials from which the most opposite systems might with equal ease be constructed? — I reply, that I have simply stated undeniable *facts;* and that when it is obvious that the general tenor of Scripture is in one direction,— if we meet with a text here and there, the words of which when taken by themselves are capable of express-

* See Dr. Cogan's admirable Letters to Mr. Wilberforce, on the doctrine of Hereditary Depravity.

ing a different sentiment, it is our duty, if they are ambiguous, to give them such an interpretation as is conformable to the general sense of Scripture, and at all events to take those passages which are clear and plain as the key by which to interpret the more obscure and difficult. Above all, we should beware of the unreasonable and baneful practice of heaping together detached texts collected from every part of the Bible, regardless of their connexion and original intention. This is a flagrant abuse of the word of God — a *wresting* of the Scripture, if not to our destruction, at least to our serious loss and danger. It has contributed more than any one thing that could be named to the divisions among Christians and the scoffs of unbelievers; who, when they find contending parties confidently professing to derive from the same sacred standard, doctrines apparently the most opposite, are naturally induced to represent the whole as vague and uncertain; and consequently destitute of the character which we seem entitled to expect in a revelation proceeding from the God of truth.

It seems to me, however, impossible to deny that the *general tenor* of holy writ has no tendency to encourage the belief that all mankind, as descendants of Adam, are born with a prevailing disposition to evil, and nothing but evil continually. Whatever inferences systematic theologians may have ventured to draw from a very few insulated and misunderstood texts, the Bible at large teaches us that God has made man *right;* that He has created Him in his own image, having breathed into him a living soul—inspired him with a rational understanding whereby he is able to contemplate his Maker's works, and to show forth His praise; to receive His laws, to acknowledge their excellence and obligation, and to render a reasonable and willing obedience. Thus we are endowed by our heavenly Father with a mental and moral constitution worthy of His creatures and children, and the world in which we are placed is well adapted not only for our present happiness and comfort, but for supplying such means of moral discipline and improvement as shall tend to refine and purify our natures, and gradually prepare them for a more blissful state. Far from having any ground to vilify the nature which God has given us, it becomes us to bless and glorify Him who hath made us what we are. We are called upon alike by reason and revelation — by our consciousness of those noble faculties which raise us above the beasts of the field, and assimilate us to more exalted intelligences — by our observation of what passes in the world — by the experienced efficacy of the education which the present state was intended and is admirably calculated to administer, in exercising and strengthening our powers, enlarging our understandings, so that they may take a clear and steady view of things real though invisible, and finall-

placing our affections upon things above — to acknowledge and adore His infinite wisdom and goodness who has so richly furnished his rational offspring with the most valuable gifts, and surrounded us with the means and motives to cultivate and improve them to the utmost. He has made us but a little lower than the angels; and even this inferiority is but for a short time; for He has abundantly enabled us, if we will, to advance from strength to strength and from glory to glory. Our reason, which is His inspiration, teaches us to admire and be grateful for His present bounties, and through Christ He hath opened our eyes to His future intention concerning us, which it only rests with ourselves to realize by a diligent and conscientious improvement of our present opportunities.

I shall conclude with earnestly recommending the sentiment of a very learned and eminent writer already quoted, in treating of this subject. "If in this discourse you have discovered any truth which you did not before understand, it is my earnest request that you would rather lay it up in your hearts for your own use, than make it the subject of contention and strife, the fuel of party zeal, or the occasion of despising or censuring those who do not see it. And if you should enter into discourse about it, let it be with all moderation and coolness on your part, in the spirit of peace and mutual forbearance. And therefore, never converse on this or any other point with an *angry* man; passion and heat blind the judgment; nor with a *bigot*, who is determined to support a particular scheme, and resolved to open his eyes to no other evidence. Whenever anger and bigotry appear in a conversation already begun, break it off, for you cannot proceed to any good purpose, and will be in danger of catching a spirit which is quite contrary to the gospel. Hold the truth in love. Restrain and regulate your passions; be constant in reading the Scriptures, fervent in prayer to God, that he will open the eyes of your understandings to discern all important and necessary truth; be watchful against every temptation, and zealous in every good work; and then look with joy for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, for he will assuredly appear to your everlasting salvation." *

---

* See Taylor's Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin.—(p 259.)

[From the Christian Reformer, London, August, 1846.]

SCRIPTURE PROOFS AND SCRIPTURAL ILLUSTRATIONS OF UNITARIANISM. By John Wilson.

We return with pleasure to the consideration of Mr. Wilson's valuable "Illustrations of Unitarianism." In the collection of texts and formal arguments to prove that Christ was inferior, dependent, subordinate, &c., we are sometimes sensible of a painful impression, lest in dwelling upon these particulars we should seem to betray a disposition to degrade the Saviour, and fail in the honor justly due to him, who was still, with reference to us, the most excellent of all created beings, far exalted above all principalities and powers,—lest in denying him the attributes of divinity, we should lose sight of that kingdom above every kingdom where he now reigns inferior to Him alone who hath put all things under him. It is true that this necessity is put upon us by the circumstances of the controversial position which we occupy, in which we are so often called upon to bring those things most prominently forward which we reject and repudiate, in respect of which we differ from other Christian disciples, that it may seem as if other things of greater intrinsic importance,—positive truths of infinite value, which we hold with a firm, an abiding, and (we trust) a practical faith,—were kept studiously in the back ground. Hence it is that our creed has been stigmatized as *negative*, cold, theoretical, unfitted to influence the heart and life. If ever there has been apparent ground for this charge in the controversial writings of Unitarians, it is, we repeat, the mere accident of their position, which has placed them, more frequently than they could wish, under the unpleasant necessity not merely of defending and enforcing their own views, but of explaining why they do *not* believe those of their opponents. It is scarcely necessary to say, that we plead Not Guilty to the imputation. The Unitarian faith is as real, positive and substantial as any other; in our estimation, it is better fitted than any other to exercise a beneficial influence over the heart, —to direct the soul to God through Christ,—to speak peace to the wounded spirit. But our situation as a *church-militant* has undoubtedly a tendency to give a disproportionate prominence to points of difference and contention, and thus constitutes one of the moral dangers to which Unitarian Christians are exposed, more especially those who make it their business to come forward as the champions of their peculiar opinions.

From this danger we think our author has, on the whole, guarded himself very successfully. His work, indeed, cannot be called, in the proper sense of the word, controversial, as he does not enter the lists against any particular adversary, and is consequently less liable to be affected by the heats of personal excitement, or to lose sight of the interests of truth in the unworthy desire to gain an empty triumph over an opponent in debate. But when engaged in showing at length why certain opinions very generally maintained are not countenanced by reason or Scripture, he has not failed to bring into view at the same time the opinions which he and other Unitarians rejoice in embracing of the real office and dignity of the Saviour, and of the true purport of his heavenly message.

"We do not call Christ," says he, "'a *mere* man; for though this expression may have been used to mean what is here indicated by the phrase, 'in nature only a man,' it is liable to be understood in a very different sense, as if it implied that our Lord and Saviour should be regarded *in no other point of view* than as an ordinary man,—a notion which, we venture to say, is repugnant to the whole genius of Christian Unitarianism, which sees in Jesus Christ, not a mere human being, but the godlike Man of Nazareth, morally connected,—by the purity of his character, the divinity of his works and the excellence of his offices,—in so intimate a manner with the universal Parent, as to exhibit those perfections of the Deity which are best calculated to develop the higher and better principles of our nature; in other words, to effect a union between God and men, similar to that which subsisted between God and his well-beloved Son."—P. 89, note.

In the same strain he proceeds at greater length in another place.

"It cannot, however, be denied, that our Lord and Saviour frequently spoke of himself, and was spoken of by prophets and apostles, in terms which raise him far above the greatest of divine teachers; but this will not be felt surprising, when it is remembered that God gave unto him the spirit without measure. It is freely acknowledged, too, that Jesus regarded himself, and was regarded by others, as bearing a relation to the universal Father, and to the world which he came to save, of a higher and more sublime nature than that sustained by any other of God's children, even the greatest and the best. And why? Because He who breathed a divine spirit into the souls of Moses and Plato, and lifted them above their fellow-men, could and *did* breathe a diviner spirit into the soul of Jesus;—'because God anointed him with the oil of gladness above *his fellows;*' endowing him with qualifications above those of prophets and philosophers, and consecrating him to a work superior to any ever accomplished in the annals of the world,—the deliverance of mankind from sin and misery. With Jesus himself, and with the primitive teachers

of his gospel, we believe that he was the only-begotten or well-beloved Son of God; that in his person, his teachings and his miracles, and particularly in the simple grandeur of his moral character, combining as it did the holiness and compassion of the Father who dwelt in him, with the devotion of a Son, and the virtues of a man perfected through suffering and through likeness to God,—he proved himself to be the Saviour and the Judge of the human race, the image of the invisible God, and the express image of his person; existing in the form of God, having within him all the fulness of God, and being one, in soul and purpose, with the infinite Father. We believe that God's Messenger and Representative possessed as much of the wisdom and power of the Deity as was requisite for the great and important purposes for which he was sent into the world; that he was constituted the power and wisdom of God for the salvation of both Jew and Gentile; that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge which were hidden in him he communicates to his followers, in order to enrich them with a wealth which the world can neither give nor take away; and that he was appointed by God to be the Sovereign of his church, the King of kings and Lord of lords,—having as such all authority entrusted to him in heaven and on earth,—the authority of ruling over the hearts and conduct of his followers, till the consummation of all things, when he shall deliver up his kingdom to God, even the Father, and when he shall be subject unto Him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. We believe that wherever exists the spirit of Christianity, *there* is Christ present in his spirit and in his power, not only to apostles and evangelists, but to all his disciples, who in every age and in every nation meet each other with devout hearts and benevolent aims; and that he is the object of reverential love and attachment, to all who practically believe in his name, honoring and obeying the Son of God, because he was the Messenger of the universal Parent. In scriptural senses such as these, and not according to the definitions of a precise, dogmatic theology, do we recognise in Jesus Christ his supremacy, his omnipotence, his omnipresence, his unrivalled wisdom and goodness, without infringing on the absolute and infinite perfections of that Being from whom he derived all that he possessed—life, spirit, power, excellence, the capability of teaching, of regenerating, of dying, rising and ascending for, a guilty race.

"We can therefore easily conceive that the Holy One of God,—though one of God's own creation,—should have been the theme of prophetical song and apostolic praise; and that, from the imperfection of human language adequately to convey just notions of the character and perfections of the Deity, the apostles should, in the fulness of their burning hearts, have sometimes used expressions, in relation to their Lord and Master, which approximate to those employed of God himself. But we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that the mightiest of the epithets and characters attributed to Christ, are qualified by language clearly

showing that Jesus was regarded by the sacred writers and speakers, and that he regarded himself, as a being infinitely inferior to God; we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that the whole tenor of the Bible, from Genesis to the Revelation, is fraught with declarations and clear implications, not of a Triune God, but of THE SIMPLE AND UNDIVIDED ONENESS OF THE SUPREME BEING,—THE INFINITE SUPERIORITY OF THE GOD AND FATHER OF JESUS CHRIST."—Pp. 323, 324.

The third chapter of the first part is devoted to an examination of the scriptural meaning of the terms "Spirit," "Holy Spirit," "Spirit of God." The result of the inquiry is to show, that when these terms are understood of a person or intelligent agent, they are equivalent to the Almighty, the Divine Mind, the Father; that in the great majority of cases they denote various manifestations of the Divine power or wisdom, or the communication of supernatural knowledge or power to the prophets of God, particularly to the Lord Jesus Christ, and through him to his apostles; while in other cases they are employed in describing the purifying influence of the Gospel on the minds of men, or the prevalence of affections and dispositions becoming the Christian profession. In the corresponding chapter of the second part, we have a more particular examination of those passages which are supposed to favor the notion of a separate person or agent, called the Holy Ghost or Spirit, distinct from the Father, the third person in the Trinity, and the ascription to this Spirit of divine characters or attributes in a distinct and peculiar form. He endeavors to show that none of these passages, when rightly understood, require or even countenance the doctrine it is proposed to deduce from them, and that they are in no degree inconsistent with the inference derived from the more general induction previously given.

We have not space to enter into the particulars of this inquiry as stated by our author. Those who are desirous of pursuing it at greater length, will derive great assistance from the work itself, which we earnestly recommend to their attention for that purpose. We are apt to think that his investigation would have been somewhat simplified, if he had adverted to the frequent unauthorized insertion of the definite article by our translators where it is not found in the original. Thus, Rom. xiv. 17, "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in *the* Holy Ghost;" rather, "in *a* holy spirit;"— that is, peace and joy inspired and animated by a consciousness of the Divine presence and favor, and by the habitual influence of the spirit of the gospel inciting and directing to all righteousness. The insertion of the definite article is to be ascribed, we think, in this and many other instances, mainly to the influence of theological prejudice; and the effect

has certainly been to encourage in those who form their notions of Scripture language and Scripture truth entirely from our public version, an idea of the distinct personality of this holy spirit, and of divine attributes and functions ascribed to *him*, to which the genuine and unperverted expressions of the original writers afford no sanction or countenance.

We cannot conclude our remarks without again expressing our obligations to Mr. Wilson for the pleasure and information he has afforded to many readers already, and which we trust he will continue to afford to a still increasing number,—and our hope, that we may again meet him in a walk where he has shown himself so well qualified to render eminent service to the cause of Scripture truth.

[From the Christian Reformer, London, August, 1846.]

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

PROFESSOR WALLACE'S VALEDICTORY ADDRESS.

In the brief report which last month we were able to give of the Examination in the Theological department at Manchester New College, we stated that at the close of the examination on the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion, Professor Wallace delivered an address to his pupils. That admirable document (for which, at the meeting on the following day, the Professor received a unanimous vote of cordial thanks from the Trustees of the College) we are now enabled to give to our readers. Before doing so, it may be well to record, that the questions were close and searching, and that the answers prepared and read by the young men were full and perfectly satisfactory, showing that the instructions offered them had been of the best and soundest kind, and that they had been fully comprehended by those for whose benefit they had been prepared.

ADDRESS.

As my official connection with Manchester New College will soon cease, and the present is the last public opportunity I may have of personally address-

ing its assembled friends, I wish to give utterance to a few valedictory words.

Six years have now elapsed since I was appointed to the office of Theological Professor in this institution; and I have been most anxious, during the whole of that time, that the interests of religious truth should not suffer in my hands. My object has been rather to set before those of my classes which are strictly theological, the results which have been attained by the most eminent men in the departments of Biblical Criticism and Interpretation, than to exalt into undue importance the passing novelties of the day. Young men are apt to look with too partial an eye upon the speculations of their contemporaries, and to regard as antiquated and obsolete all which passed before their own time. This they will find, as life advances, and the sphere of their knowledge is extended, to be a great mistake. The truth is, that, in some branches of study, and not least of all in Theology, the reason why so many crude theories are now broached, is because so much has been accomplished by preceding writers, that comparatively little remains to be done by their successors; and for my own part, though I would by no means depreciate the labors of living authors, I can state with some degree of confidence, as the result of a long and careful study of the subject, that, compared with what was done in the department of Theology by the writers of the last generation, the achievements of those of the present day are trifling and insignificant. I have endeavored, therefore, to the best of my ability, to lead the young men who have attended my classes, through a course of study which, while it recognized everything that is valuable in the new schools of Theology, did not aim at doing this by sneering at the labors of previous writers; — a course, in short, which was adapted to inform, rather than to entertain and amuse those who attended it, and to prepare them for fulfilling the office of religious instructors to others, and becoming able and judicious expounders of the sacred records.

This it has been my wish to effect, with as little of a theological bias as was compatible with a faithful performance of my duty. I have never dissembled my own honestly-formed opinions, when I felt called upon to state them; and I have never intentionally concealed or misrepresented the opinions of others. No attempt has ever been made by me to restrain that freedom of inquiry which has in times past been the characteristic and honorable distinction of the Non-subscribing Dissenters. I have *spoken* freely myself; and have left those whom I have addressed to *think* and *act* freely. But it has ever been my object to treat Christianity with respect, as a revelation emanating from God, and confirmed by the attestation of miracle. Had my views respecting it been at all different from this, I should have deemed myself an unworthy occupant of the theological chair in this Christian institution.

Of course I cannot be answerable for the effect which these views may have had upon the minds of others. But I shall retire from my office with a consciousness that I have done my duty towards those whose theological studies it was my business to superintend, and shall continue to hope well concerning their future respectability and usefulness in the church and in the world.

I have now to express my thanks to the members of the Committee, and to my brother Professors, for the courtesy which I have uniformly received from them.

To the Students also, who have attended my classes, I beg to offer my acknowledgments for the respectful manner in which, with scarcely an exception, they have been in the habit of listening to my instructions.

On many accounts I cannot but regret the dissolution of my connexion with this institution; but I feel confident that my place will be well supplied by the gentleman who has been appointed to succeed me. His career will be watched with great interest by others as well as myself; and it is my sincere and earnest prayer that the blessing of God may rest upon his labors.

THE DESIGNED EFFECTS OF CHRISTIANITY.

A Discourse, delivered at the Mission Chapel, Montague-Street, Bristol, on Sunday Evening, May 31, 1846. By JAMES BAYLEY.

JOHN, x. 10.

"*I am come that they might have life.*"

LIFE and death, are terms frequently used in Scripture, in a manner which evidently does not indicate existence, or its termination. Jesus on one occasion observes, "This is *life* eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." But we should certainly be at a loss to discover any necessary connexion between this knowledge and the preservation of our being. Again, he says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." This, taken literally, would be to exhort to cannibalism, — a sense so palpably absurd, that all agree in giving it a figurative interpretation; except, indeed, one class of professing Christians, who, to preserve the literal sense, assume the power of changing bread and wine into the real body and blood of Christ, and swallowing them, imagine they have fulfilled his declaration. And again, in the text, "I am come that they might have *life*." But existence had been enjoyed by the Jews and others, and has been since enjoyed by millions who never heard his name.

In considering "*the designed effects of Christianity*," we shall better understand the nature of this life, and the blessings the Gospel is calculated to impart.

Life is indicated in the body by activity and consciousness; and when these are destroyed, there is death. And as with the whole, so it may be with a part. A limb, or any portion of our system, may be paralyzed, and rendered incapable of motion and feeling, and we say at once the part is dead: a restoration to its former state is giving to it life.

But there are higher faculties in our nature than consciousness and activity of motion. These are the lowest forms of our existence, and are enjoyed by lower animals equally with ourselves. We have *mind*, — we can exercise thought, reflection, judgment. But we know, from experience, these powers may be weakened, if not destroyed, at least for all reasonable purposes. By some, the reasoning faculties are so little exercised that they have become weak, sleepy,—dead. To rouse them to

active exertion, is to awaken, strengthen, to make them lively,—to give them *life*, by stimulating them to active exercise.

We have also affections. We can love,—we can love intensely. Our love may embrace child, parent, friend, country,—the world. It may be contracted into self,—it may sleep,—die. Its energy may be so weakened that the individual may be incapable of the slightest emotions of pity. During the horrible retreat of the French from Moscow a mother had abandoned her little son, only five years old. In spite of his cries and tears, she had driven him away from her sledge, which was too heavily laden. Twice was the unfortunate child replaced in the arms of its mother by those standing by; and twice did she cast him off in the frozen snow, and absolutely refuse to take her son. Here natural affection was dead. Reviving this sentiment in her breast, would have been giving back the *life* it had lost.

We have *conscience*—a rebuking faculty. How shall we describe it? The faculty that reproves if we knowingly falter in the path of duty. It is not the guiding power (reason is that), but the power that goads and stings; and oh, how terribly! when we are unwilling to pursue the course we know is right. But it may become dull in its operations; it may be hardened and insensible; like the flesh seared with a hot iron, it may lose its feeling. Scripture speaks of *dead* consciences,—of men without the faculty that makes them sensible of wrong being alive within them. To give it *life*, is to recall it to activity, and make it speak with vigor its salutary admonitions.

We have also *religious sentiment*. What is it? Words fail to express it properly; yet it is in us, and, when we yield ourselves up to its influence, produces effects with which, in comparison, the effects of all other sentiments are as nothing. It is the most powerful when excited that can possibly animate a human being; therefore, it has been liable to abuses of greater magnitude than any other, and, in proportion, produced more lamentable effects. But it may languish, it may sleep, it may die; at least to all good forms of manifestation; and the pure sentiment may require to be revived, exercised, strengthened, restored to life.

There are, in short, in our constitution, faculties of an infinitely higher and more powerful nature than those manifested by our bodily senses; and of which these latter are, in fact, the servants and instruments for their use. They are our spiritual nature; and, as by evil circumstances, or want of due exercise, this nature may become dull, drowsy, and lifeless (but not destroyed without the utter loss of existence), so by proper application it may be restored to its wonted vigor. It was to revive, strengthen, and restore this nature to its proper life, that Christ

came and directed the labors of his mission; and the language of exhortation is, "awake thou that sleepest, and Christ shall give thee life."

This life has relation to all the circumstances of our being, through time and eternity. Our bodies may and will undergo considerable change; but our spiritual faculties, by which we retain our identity,—a perfect knowledge of ourselves as we have been, as well as what we are,—will remain essentially the same. We may observe this during the present period of our existence. The *man* is not what he was in infancy and childhood. He may be so altered, that recognition of the same being is entirely impossible. But memory, recalling a knowledge of former events and emotions, preserves a consciousness of our former selves, gives us a sense of the continuance of our being, and enables us to restore to the perception of others a consciousness of our continued existence.

Our knowledge of ourselves and others in a more spiritual state of existence will depend on these higher faculties of our nature. They will preserve most vividly the impressions received and the tone acquired during our former existence, and leave us exposed in our consciousness to the effects they are calculated to produce. Consciousness excites regret or pleasure in the recollection of the past, according as it has been abused or improved, and this will be a source of our misery or happiness in that more spiritual state of existence for which we are destined. It will also be more acute from the change in our being, necessarily producing an increase of pain or enjoyment, from the circumstance that, as the gratification of a vicious taste lessens the pain it would otherwise create, so the loss of the power to gratify it, with the *desire* still burning, must increase it to intensity. On the contrary, the obstruction to the gratification of pure spiritual emotion being removed, must increase and leave the soul that has labored only to improve, to elevate, to purify itself, to the full enjoyment of the happiness such elevation and purity necessarily impart. We see this in the retributive nature of the present life. The waste of the present hour causes regret and pain in the succeeding one; or, at least, the loss of the enjoyment which its proper use would have bestowed. The abuse of youth makes the ignorant and unhappy man; but the pleasures which youth can still enjoy, render him blind to the miseries he must endure in age when youthful pleasures will cease to gratify, and the desire will remain without the means to satisfy it. Therefore is the happiness to be derived from the improvement of our spiritual nature *everlasting*, as distinguished from that which, ministering only to the gratification of our inferior nature, is temporary, and must cease when that nature shall cease to be. And how painful must this

retribution be! Figures fail to give an adequate idea. Well is it described as the undying worm and the unquenchable fire, —torturing, burning the polluted soul! Who has not witnessed old age succeeding ill-spent youth and manhood?—torturing recollections, pining discontent, evil thoughts of others, creating a burning hell in his own breast! The future must realize this for multitudes who only live for the gratification of self,—of mere earthly desires,—when earth with its numberless gratifications must shrink from their grasp. Let us try to acquire true life. Life for the mind; life for our affections; life for our conscience; life for the religious sentiment, the highest, holiest, strongest faculty of our nature. Let us inquire how Christ can give us this life.

I have said that our spiritual life has relation to all the circumstances of our being. Christ sought to invigorate it by precept and example. He repeated the commandments of the law, which were good, and which, if a man kept, he might live in them. But it was found possible for a man to keep them and yet be destitute of a spirit of goodness. They had ceased to be evidence of a life-giving principle within, and Jesus found it necessary to make additional precepts; or, in his application of the existing law, expose the absurdities of interpreters, and the want of a living principle in the practice of those who professed to obey. The law commanded to "honor father and mother," but a man was released from the obligation by making a gift to the temple. The sanctity of an oath was despised if a man swore by the temple and not the gold, or by the altar and not the gift upon it. The purer principles of the Saviour made not only an oath, by whatever sworn, but a word as obligatory and binding on the conscience. A young man once came who had kept the commandments from his youth up, yet he was not possessed of absolute devotion to truth and duty. A law becomes useless when men have found out how they may comply with the letter without being influenced by the spirit. "The letter killeth, it is the spirit that giveth life." A man was forbidden to steal, and the spirit of the precept would be, — let a principle of integrity regulate all your dealings. This would forbid fraudulent transactions of every kind; but many assume that, while they refrain from taking the purse from the pocket, it is no theft to take the money by deceitful arts of trade. I have read of a man perceiving money drop from another and apply it to his own use, and consider he did not steal. To such miserable evasions do men have recourse to gratify selfishness, and silence the upbraidings of the conscience. These instances may serve to show the necessity of our acquiring a principle for the regulation of our conduct, and the higher life we should acquire for our spiritual nature. He who walketh in the spirit is not under the law

By mere deeds of the law he shall not be justified, — he shall not be esteemed pure in the eyes of a heart-searching God. Laws have ever been found ineffectual for absolute restraint and the perfection of the character. "Laws," says an Apostle, "are for the lawless, disobedient, and sinners." "Laws," says one of our own writers, "are made to bind the villains of society," but villains soon learn to evade them. The good man needs them not, and it is one of the designed effects of Christianity to call into action a principle, — to impart a life, which would render laws unnecessary, and, leaving us free from all outward restraints, subject us to the control of a spirit, that, in its operations, would bless the human race with perfect order and peace.

It is obviously the design of Christianity to impart the clearest and justest ideas of duty, and to inspire with the purest motives to its discharge. "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do you even so unto them." "Love thy neighbor as thyself." More certain guides to duty we cannot have. In all our calculations let us but turn within, and consider whether the mode of conduct we propose to pursue towards others, would be agreeable to our feelings and interests if adopted by them towards us, and we should neither deviate from the path of integrity, nor disobey the promptings of pure benevolence. Our affections would be chastened and strengthened; our perceptions of duty cleared and heightened; our resolutions invigorated; our minds elevated; our consciences refined; the religious sentiment purified and continually raising us to the *Source* of truth and goodness, and conforming us in character to the likeness of our divine and benignant parent.

But Christ taught not merely by precept. His *example* is afforded us as teaching, if possible, still more clearly. Example we admit without dispute to be stronger than precept; and Jesus is presented to us in his life as an illustration of the principles he maintained. "For their sake," he says, "I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified through the truth." Had he lived a life contrary to his teachings, their effect would have been destroyed, and those who went forth from him would have lost that powerful incentive they had to duty in his conduct. They endured toil, suffering, scorn, and horrible deaths in their perseverance to teach their principles, and impart that divine life to others of which they felt they had received so largely from him. "As he laid down his life for us, we ought also to lay down our lives for the brethren." Such was the effect of example, which could not have been produced though he had uttered the same precepts, wrought the same miracles, and left the same discourses as those recorded by the Evangelists. Principles cannot be maintained without consistency of life; and hence we may feel, if we are fully sensible of the value of Christian prin-

ciple, the obligations we are under to him who could thus sacrifice himself for the sake of man, and perceive in what sense we are redeemed by the blood of his cross. No doubt, much of the inefficacy of religious instruction may be attributed to the want of this example on the part of instructors; and the absence of the Christian spirit in the lives of professing Christians, has rendered the Christian faith obnoxious to multitudes. Because we are infidel to the spirit, others are infidel to the letter of the Gospel. Infidelity to Christianity in an observer is impossible if he see it manifested in the life. As well may we say a man is infidel to the belief in his own existence, or to the existence of nature around him. We propose Christianity for reception and belief, but do not ourselves obey it, and, thereby, practically teach others to disregard its admonitions and spurn its truths. The odiousness of vice we do not fail to perceive and acknowledge when presented to the view; nor can we fail to perceive the excellence of virtue, — of truth, integrity, brotherly-kindness, charity, — nor reject the evidence they afford of a superior spirit in the being who manifests them. And these are the christian life, — the vigor, activity, power which Christian principle is to impart to our affections and conscience.

The example of Christ refines and quickens the conscience, as evil example serves to enfeeble and deaden it, where reason may otherwise tell us of error in our conduct. The pride, injustice, and cruelty in the world are condemned in the minds of many, who yet conform to their practice and submit to their influence, because maintained by numbers. We practise what we flatter ourselves are little sins without compunction. We tell the little lie when we think the great truth would be unpalatable or injurious. We practise the little cheat because the world allows it, and extreme integrity would be considered madness or prejudicial to our worldly interests. We practise a little cruelty because we think mercy would be cast away, and may only manifest a want of proper spirit and invite to fresh injuries. Thus we deceive ourselves, and conscience is made to slumber, and because it does not sting us sharply, we despise its gentler admonitions. In Christ we observe none of this weakness. Wickedness is rebuked in the enemy; so are cruelty, ambition, and fear in friends. They are told of their weakness, and the devoted follower is reproved as Satan. Truth is uttered though offence is given, and destruction, foreseen, is to be the result Such an example must rebuke our weakness, and quicken the admonitions of the conscience, when we are weakly disposed to excuse error in ourselves because the common error of mankind.

Jesus Christ never tolerated wrong so as to encourage the individual to pursue an erring course. He was forbearing, merciful, forgiving; but not to encourage sin. He condemned not

the adulterous woman, but still bade her "go and sin no more." He healed the diseased man, but warned him,—"sin no more, lest a worse thing come upon thee." We are willing to assume, when considering the mercifulness of God, that he will excuse our failings and pardon our neglect of duty, which we consider induced by natural weakness, and, therefore, take no precaution to guard, in future, against "the sin that most easily besets us." Mercy is promised, and the teachings of nature are agreeable to the declarations of Scripture as regards the sinner. But it is repented and forsaken sin that is "blotted out," not the merely regretted indulgence of a weakness, which we admit to be wrong, and against which we should be more earnestly alive to overcome its influence. Nature, I say, agrees with Scripture in this particular, and thereby confirms the truth and authority of its teachings. Vicious inclinations cause pain as long as they are indulged; but their destruction, which may be effected by zealous perseverance, removes at the same time the pain they create, and leaves us to experience the happiness which virtuous habit always imparts, as well as the pleasure to be experienced from a sense of virtuous effort to improve ourselves. Sin must be destroyed before we can experience happiness; and genuine repentance is, not unavailing tears of regret and bitter remorse, but earnest persevering effort to correct the evil we have indulged. Pardon and the happiness of heaven are not promised to us if we continue to submit to the influence of vicious desire. "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and turn unto the Lord who will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." Such is the language and tenor of Scripture throughout. The mercy and pardon of our Heavenly Father are not like the weak and foolish fondness of some earthly parent, who, in his forbearance, indulges the folly of his chlid, and confirms a habit which will increase the moral malady of his offspring, and the misery of a perverted heart. Like a wise and *truly* merciful parent, earnestly bent on promoting the *lasting* happiness of his child, he corrects what is amiss, and in the privation of *immediate* enjoyment, induces feelings and habits which are their own reward, and in their possession impart a bliss which cannot be taken away.

It is, then, true mercy, as well as duty, to forbear reproaches for the past, and forgive repented sin, but still with firm, unyielding aim, to correct the erring, and induce a life which shall of itself impart bliss to the possessor. This is true charity, and not the smile or favor which may produce momentary comfort, but does not create within that "well of living water that springeth up to everlasting life." The parent may be creating comforts for his child; he may be laying up stores of wealth for

his enjoyment; but only to make him a weak and puny thing, to be guarded and preserved by outward good, but with no strength nor treasure in his mind and heart to guard and keep him when the outward fails. The earthly parent so desires and acts,—not so our heavenly. He has put the power *within* ourselves to work out our salvation; and the operations of his providence and grace are designed to give it energy, activity, and life. The pain, the toil, the misery to which humanity is exposed, are not the frowns and curses of an angry God, or proof of his neglect; but wise, beneficent, and timely admonition to mankind to correct what, otherwise, will in the future require severer pain, and cause intenser agony. Our experience proves there cannot possibly be happiness but from ourselves. The possession of the earth itself would give no peace nor comfort to a vicious heart; but with internal purity, with the possession of a virtuous heart, the world may be defied to rob us of true peace, though not the merest atom of its surface be possessed, nor multitude of goods surround us.

Mankind have yet to learn wherein their true wealth lies. Sages and holy men, in all countries and ages, have arisen to warn men of the folly of supposing that the highest good is to be realized in the possession of wealth. To have more than we can eat or drink or wear, is esteemed the desirable thing, and without the possession or assurance of which the heart lacks ease. Why, with sufficiency of these, should not man learn to be content? There would then be no pride, no selfish ambition, no cruelty, no wars nor fightings among us. It is religion's dictate,—it is christian piety and wisdom. But do not mistake its application. Is it only for him who has only these, or less than these?—is it only for him whose labor suffices for a day, and whose anxious fear it is that the accident of the morrow may deprive him of needful good, and leave him and his in utter destitution, or in mean dependence on the cold and heartless charities of life? Pride so applies it, and thus would be the teacher of humility. Avarice so applies it, and thus would teach a noble disregard of earthly goods. Ambition so applies it, and, while burning with insatiable desire, would teach to others the lessons of content. Cruelty so applies it, and thus would be the teacher of a heavenly meekness, and calm submission to our Maker's will. Oh, what impious mockery of the words of truth! what blasphemous perversion of the dictates of the Universal Father's love! "Having food and raiment, therewith let us be content." The lesson is for him who has more than enough, and bids him hold his hand, and not be grasping at what in nature's distribution is destined for another. It bids him leave what he does not *need*, and be content with the satisfaction of his natural wants, though circumstances afford the

opportunity, and offer the temptation, to gather into storehouse and barn for future luxury and ease.

Thus practically applying a precept, we are enabled to perceive its wisdom, its beneficence, and thence learn its truth. The example of Christ enforces and binds it on the consciences of all who would be his disciples. The world offers strong temptations to deviate from Christian rule; but so was Christ tempted,—"in all points as we are,"—and he resisted and overcame the world. He would have been flattered by the great, would he have made himself a Christ after their heart. The multitude would have continued to honor him, would he have realized their expectations and sought their national glory. The allurements of national greatness rose to his view in the solitude of the mountain, and, if the promptings of ambition had been preferred by him to the purification of the human heart, he would not have died for man,—he would not have been sacrificed for the maintenance of the elevating principles of his faith. To all there is a higher or a lower mountain top, from which we gaze around on the circle of friends, or party, or country, or mankind, and our Satans,—pride, interest, ambition, love of distinction and rule, whisper to our hearts,—"*Be chief.* Covet the highest honor you can gain from your fellow mortals. If you cannot be the master of a nation, be the master of a party, or chief of a religious sect, or absolute ruler of your friends or family. Fall down and worship pride and selfishness, and this power shall be given you." Rebuke these Satans. Love and serve,—not govern. Instruct and raise above, and not depress beneath, your rule. Desire that the glory you have, or fancy you possess, may be made the heritage of others, that they may be one with you;—not less nor dependant, but equal and as good, or better. "Let each esteem the other better than themselves,"—so said an Apostle.

The cultivation of the religious sentiment would give us strength to meet and overcome the temptations that surround us. The example of Christ warrants the assumption, and its effects, as manifested in the history of the world, assure us of its efficacy. It has made the weak strong in the maintenance of right. It has nerved the arm and heart of the despised and insulted portion of mankind, and achieved a victory for the spurned and trampled conscience, over the abettors of superstition, priestcraft, and misrule. It has knit heart to heart, and united, as one man, hosts that would otherwise have been divided, scattered, and subdued before the tyrants and oppressors of mankind. It has rendered the solitary heart too strong for the world's scorn, and the flame and gallows to subdue. "Ye leave me alone," said the Saviour, on one occasion, "and yet I am not alone," he immediately adds, "the Father is with me." This sentiment

may have been misdirected. The object to be attained may not have been the highest or purest. It may, and has been abused by the crafty leader,—the ambitious ruler. It may have degenerated into superstition, urging its victim through dread of an ever-present and angry God. It may have become fanaticism goading on to deeds of cruelty and persecution to avenge the profanation of religion. Yet there it is in its strength,—the more terrible for its mightiness,—the more dreadful for its misdirection. We have only to realize in our own minds what are its true objects, and feel the requisite stimulus to pursue them. It does not require us to burst forth upon the world with the fierceness of the lightning,—the fury of the tempest. Let us copy the example of our master,—let us imitate the conduct of God. His most beneficent power is manifested in the calm sunshine and soft genial shower. Let our words, our actions, our lives, distil as dew upon the tender herb. Let us *live* religion, and we shall teach it. Let us *act* religion, and we shall enforce its obligations. Its genial influence will be softly but successfully diffused, and give light, and life, and joy to human hearts.

These are some of the designed effects of Christianity. Doubtless it is destined also to work a change in all the arrangements of our social life, and bring all the institutions of society into accordance with its righteous principles. It will "go forth conquering and to conquer, until the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our God and of his Christ." But its purity must first be realized in our individual hearts, and its principles regulate the lives of at least the majority of human beings, before our social arrangements can be brought to agree. In our progress there will be difficulties to be overcome, temptations to be resisted, the love of ease to be subdued, the opposition of enemies and friends to be encountered, and self-interest and self to be sacrificed. Eighteen hundred years ago the work was begun by Jesus of Nazareth in an obscure corner of the world, and faith sustained him to give his life for the *life* of the world. Though so obscure its origin, and humble its first promulgators, Christianity could not be hid. The name has sounded through the world. It has penetrated the palace as well as the cottage, and it commands externally the homage of the greatest mortals. Its purity has been diminished, its character distorted, its principles perverted; but it has flowed on and on, widening as a mighty river, and, notwithstanding collected impurities, proclaiming by its magnitude the exhaustless nature and elevation of its source.

How mighty and persevering have been the efforts to impart the *doctrines* of the Christian faith! To maintain the correctness of words and opinions, mines of wealth have been expended, and

oceans of blood poured forth. When will the Christian world be as earnest to enforce the pure morality of the Gospel, and bring the life to manifest its holy influence? In truth it cannot be done in the same way, and will not therefore so readily enlist the sympathy and support of the multitude. Its pure spirit enjoins self-mortification, self-restraint, self-sacrifice. This does not gratify self-esteem, and the vain and thoughtless, caught by external show, will much more readily oppose than aid its propagation. But the growing enlightenment of the mind, aiding the dictates of the conscience, will hasten its progress, and yet produce the day of true light and life. Each one will advance it in proportion as he acquires the spirit of Jesus, and in its possession will share the glory of his mission, be a dispenser of life, and cause others with himself to "have it more abundantly."

SELECTIONS.

Can beings, who hope in a few years, perhaps in a few hours, to be united in eternal happiness, be disposed to be angry with each other about trifles, and find a satisfaction in saying or doing what may give pain?—*Miss Bowdler.*

When once we deviate from the straight path, however small the deviation may be, and however strong the reasons for it, we can never know how far we may be led astray, nor what may be the consequence of that deviation. Could these be known at once, the fault which was considered merely as a trifle, would often appear shocking, even to those who paid least attention to it, though in fact they can make no difference in its real nature.—*Miss Bowdler.*

We cannot ever be framing long prayers with our lips, but almost ever our minds can throw pious glances, our heart may dart good wishes upwards; so that hardly any moment shall pass without some lightsome flashes of devotion.—*Barrow.*

[From the Unitarian, (London) August, 1846.]

BIGOTRY CURED.

Often when argument is useless, on some minds ridicule produces the desired effect.

When Dr. Thomas, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, was chaplain to the British Factory, at Hamburg, a gentleman belonging to the factory died at a village about ten miles distant, and application was made to the clergyman of the parish for leave to bury him in the churchyard. The parson inquired of what religious sentiments he had been, and was told that he died a Calvinist.

"Then," said he, "he cannot be buried here; there are none but Lutherans in my churchyard, and there shall be no other."

On this being told to Dr. Thomas, he immediately took his horse and went to argue the matter with the parson, but found him inflexible. The doctor at length gained by ridicule, what he had failed to accomplish by the force of reason.

"You remind me," says the doctor to the priest, "of a circumstance which once happened to myself, when I was curate of a church in England. I was burying a corpse, when a woman came and pulled me by the sleeve in the middle of the service. 'Sir, sir, I want to speak to you.' 'Pr'ythee,' I said, 'wait till I have done.' 'No, sir, I must speak to you immediately!' 'Why, then, what is the matter?' 'Why, sir,' she said, 'you are burying a man who died of the small pox next my poor husband, who never had it.'"

This story had the desired effect, and the curate permitted the remains of the Calvinist to be interred in a Lutheran churchyard.

THE GOOD SAMARITAN.

BY DR. BOWRING.

THERE is a tale by Jesus told;
It charmed the listeners round of old —
  A tale of that benignant man,
Who, when the proud passed heedless by
Supplied what kindness could supply —
  The good Samaritan.

Robbed, naked, wounded by the way,—
The suffering, sinking traveller lay;
  Swift to his aid his helper ran,
Bound up his wounds with tender care,
Food, raiment, home provided there —
  The good Samaritan.

And still that tale of pathos fills
The awakened heart; still touches, thrills
  With sympathy's own talisman,
The springs of generous thought to move,
And bids us imitate and love
  That good Samaritan.

A wider field is ours — not one,
Stripped, wounded, destitute, alone;
  But man in crowds neglected—man
In congregated woe—doth call
That each should be to each—to all,
  A good Samaritan.

THE

UNITARIAN.

(From the London Inquirer, No. 216.)

THE LITERARY HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. One volume, 8vo. London.

We like the conception, better than the execution of this book. The New Testament has a "literary history" as well as any other ancient work; and the title before us tacitly admits the important principle, that in one point of view it is as a portion of literary history that the New Testament is to be regarded. Here then arises the distinction between the work in its literary character, and the book in its religious character. The two are perfectly separate, and should ever be kept so. The two are so separate, that a person who disowned the authority of the New Testament as a religious guide, might be most competent to treat of the contents of the book in a literary point of view; and equally the person who was thoroughly imbued with the religious spirit of the book, might be least fitted to consider it in its literary relations. Separate and distinct as the two departments, the literary and the religious, are, they have generally been confounded, at least by the school of English orthodox divines: confusion of ideas has hence

ensued. The reverence due to religion has been paid to the book. Feelings have usurped the place of judgment. The critic has been overpowered, if not superseded, by the divine. Eternal salvation has been made dependent on points of mere scholarship. Even yet, few are the theologians in this country who apply to the New Testament the same principles of historical criticism, that are applied to profane literature. It is only by halves, and with timidity, that the "literary history of the New Testament" is studied and taught, according to the principles which govern ordinary critics in literature. There is a wish to gain the advantage which would ensue from the strictly historical treatment of the subject. There is also a fear of consequences. Between these two impulses, sacrifices are made both to feeling and to truth; now something is granted to criticism, now something is exacted for established opinions: one moment the critic prevails over the divine, the next moment the divine has his revenge on the critic. Thus the New Testament is and is not *a book* — an ancient book — a book to be historically investigated in the same manner, by similar aids, with equal rigor, as much apart from prepossession and prejudice, as the letters of Cicero or the orations of Demosthenes. Even persons who are conscious of a desire to regard the New Testament simply (in the first place) as a portion of ancient literature, find it difficult to prevent their religious feelings from giving a hue, if not a bias, to their determinations. And we are therefore of opinion, that great service has been rendered to both literature and religion in Germany, where a state of mind little short of positive unbelief, has, in chairs of theology, sat in judgment on the literary merits of the Scriptures, forming an opinion, and pronouncing a verdict, with an impartiality not the less severe because sometimes hardened by a slight infusion of prejudice. In truth, we hold that the literary merits of the New Testament will not be fairly appreciated and accurately

known, until the task is taken in hand by laymen; who, free from the bias of professional character, and the perverting influence of belief and unbelief, shall, with competent knowledge and ability, apply themselves to the critical study of the New Testament, as they would give their minds to the study of any ancient classic.

These remarks are made from a regard to truth, not from a feeling that serious errors have to be exploded. We want to see the Bible studied as a book. We claim for it literary justice. Its literary qualities are at the foundation of all its pretensions. If these are unsound, the whole superstructure is in danger. If these are solid, solid as the received remains of ancient literature, then revealed religion rests on a good basis, and has nothing to fear.

We also hold that many opinions regarding the literary claims of the Bible, current at least in this country, have at present no secure foundation of proof, or have been either exploded or modified by continental inquirers. This is another reason why the Bible (that is, *the Book*) should be strictly studied as a book.

Glad should we be could we add, that progress towards this result is being made in Great Britain. The influence of Germany will indeed prevail in the long run, and is already making itself quietly felt in our own country: but as yet under no prominent tokens or marked results of the change we desire. It is in the old ruts that the thoughts of our theologians are wont to run. What is new among us is borrowed; what is old requires revision, even by the presence of the imported novelties. Meanwhile not only is no encouragement given to, but a penalty is imposed on, the free and conscientious study of theology. If you take in hand "The Literary History of the New Testament," you are expected not to deviate from received opinions, or if you do, you must bear the consequences, in pecuniary loss and social disqualification.

The anonymous author of "The Literary History of the New Testament," which comes before the public attested by the signatures of a clergyman and a Dissenting minister, the Revs. E. Bickersteth and J. Pye Smith, does not run any serious risk of this nature in his moderately well drawn up digest of established and English opinions on the topics that he has undertaken to treat. To a person who is desirous of commencing the literary study of the New Testament, this work would be useful. As a summary of views entertained by divines characterized for respect to the past and for solid learning, the book has its value; but we cannot recommend it to persons who have studied the divines of the modern German Schools; to such it would be of little service. The work, therefore, does not realize our idea of what, in these times, a "Literary History of the New Testament" should be; for while it is by no means free from the colorings of religious prejudices and critical pre-judgments, — while it adheres to old opinions, without sufficient evidence, — it fails in taking the right position, which, we think, is at the head of what has been thought and written in Germany during the last century, apart from a knowledge and just appreciation of which, a "Literary History of the New Testament" must want the chief element of excellence. This remark we should be prepared to sustain, did we not think that German theology has modified many received conclusions; for if it contained little else than a mass of errors, even the errors of men whose industry and learning are without an equal, demand attention and need exposure. But the conclusions of German divines are not all errors. We must subjoin, that, in our opinion, they are by no means all true, and that what they have gained for scientific theology has sometimes been exaggerated, if the gain is looked for in new and indubitable positive results. We can, therefore, see truth in the following passage, extracted from the preface to the book now under notice—a passage which we select,

the rather because it will give the reader an idea of the general position on which the writer stands :—

"But at a time when it is too much the fashion to exalt the Biblical scholars of Germany at the expense of our native literature, it may be pardonable to express the conviction, that, in his peculiar line of investigation, Dr. Lardner still claims to rank as *facile princeps*, the solidity of his judgment being equalled by the accuracy of his researches, the caution of his decisions, and the prodigious range of his learning. What has been added to the product of his stupendous labors by subsequent writers, has partaken of the character of speculation, more than of induction; and, in many instances, his great work supplies the best refutation of the crude opinions of less sober and careful inquirers. To his volumes there will be found, in the following pages, continual references; although the writer has felt himself at full liberty to assert an independent judgment, and, in not a few instances, without aiming at originality, has arrived at different and what may appear novel conclusions."

The plan pursued in the work is this; after some introductory remarks on the scantiness of the existing information respecting the writers of the New Testament, — the spirit proper to the inquiry, — and the general character of the several books, the writer passes to the consideration, first of the Gospels, then of Harmonies of the Gospels, then of the Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude. The Chronology of the Acts next receives his attention, which is afterwards given to Paul's Epistles, beginning with the first letter to the Thessalonians, and ending with the Epistle to the Hebrews. Finally come the Epistles of John and the Apocalypse.

One great fault observable in theological disquisitions, is found in the facility with which presumptions, or bare probabilities, are invested with the character of proofs. From this grave error our author is scarcely more free than the bulk of English divines. We give an instance; there is reason to doubt, whether the Epistle to the Ephesians was addressed to the Christians at Ephesus, or indeed to any particular church exclusively; now mark with what easy good nature the writer settles the question :—

"It is in the highest degree improbable that St. Paul should write to the churches of Philippi, Colossæ, and Laodicea, and pass over the Christians at Ephesus, the most numerous and important church in Asia; and we must *therefore* adhere to the opinion, that the Epistle was primarily intended for the Ephesians." —P. 367.

Probably it was so intended; but does the consideration given, prove the intention? does the premise authorize the inference? The "therefore" is a *non sequitur:* and thus in theology the probable is often confounded with the certain, and the presumed with the proved; arguments are over "weighted" with conclusions, which, in consequence, are, in many cases, of little value. A severe logic needs to be applied to the subject. The result would be, that our knowledge, if less extended, would be more satisfactory; and our judgments would be attended by deeper and more operative convictions.

EXTRACTS FROM GERMAN ECCLESIASTICAL AND LITERARY JOURNALS.

[From the Berlin Universal Ecclesiastical Journal.]

FOREIGNERS usually designate Wirtemberg as the land of sects; but though it cannot be denied that many sects have there originated, or, at least, found support, this is a matter less serious than it might be elsewhere, partly because the ecclesiastical authorities there have less frequently been betrayed into acts contrary to liberty of conscience, partly because the religious communities of Wirtemberg have always retained a certain rational and Christian spirit, leading them to appropriate what is true and useful, and detect and discard error and deception. This has been shown, during the last few years, with respect to the Methodists, the Sweden-

borgians, and the Anabaptists, and will, no doubt, be manifested with regard to that sect of dissenters who have recently made themselves conspicuous under the name of the New Church, or the Apostolic Catholics. The founders of this sect were, the late Rev. Ignatius Lindl, of Elberfeld, and the button-maker, Jacob Wurz, of Basle. With respect to Lindl, it is well known, that so long as he remained a Catholic priest in Bavaria, (from 1812 to 1820,) his stirring discourses were extremely popular with both Protestants and Catholics, till he at length emigrated, with some of his followers, to Southern Russia Here he was at first protected by Alexander, but gave so much offence, by his singular attempts to amalgamate Catholicism and Protestantism, that he was compelled to quit Russia. He then attached himself decidedly to the Evangelical Church, was appointed preacher in Wupperthal, and was even proposed as pastor at Kornthal. The inhabitants, however, during his probatory visit, becoming better aware of his character, the invitation was dropped. He, indeed, wandered more and more from the simple doctrines of the Gospel, adopted a half-Catholic mysticism, grew more and more bitter against the Evangelical Church, and abandoned himself so far to apocalyptic visions, that his followers, if not himself, believed him to be one of the two witnesses in Revelations. Jacob Wurz was originally employed in a silk manufactory at Basle ; he always showed a tendency to fanaticism, increased by his weak constitution. As early as the year 1822, he excited much attention by the revelations which he professed to have received, and connected himself with certain sectarians in the canton of Aargau, who called themselves Gabrielites, because they declared that they received revelations from the angel Gabriel. Through this connection, he became intimate with Prof. Sachenal, of Basle, a rich and influential patron of the marvellous. The latter improved the style of the uncultivated artisan's revelations, received him into his house

and at his table, and so far improved his pecuniary circumstances, that he was able to provide separate board and maintenance for his wife, who, though with no feelings of hostility, lived apart from him. Through this Wurz, the parent congregation of the New Church was founded at Basle. Many natives of Wirtemberg became members, chiefly those who had previously joined almost every sect, without persevering in their attachment to any. Among them is the former vine-dresser, now miller, Johann Knaux, of Grunbach. This man, from his youth, had been a frequenter of private religious meetings; but instead of improving these opportunities for his own edification, he was always desirous of being distinguished above others, while his litigious spirit rendered the society by no means disposed to choose him as their leader. He therefore sought admission into other sects, — first among the original Separatists, — then ran the round of the Michelians, the Baptists, the Methodists, — allied himself with the travelling preacher, G. Werner, — read Swedenborg's works, — entered into Lindl's visions, — and finally allied himself to Wurz. He had not, for some time, attended church regularly, but went to receive the sacrament, though without preparatory confession. For a year and a half, however, both he and his wife have entirely avoided the church. The sect does not profess to aim at making proselytes, but zealously distributes Lindl's "New Church, or the Revived Apostolic Church, under the Third Œconomy of God,"— and Wurz's "Views Beyond the Grave," and "Reasons for Quitting the Old Church." The meetings at Grunbach are held in the mill, under Knaux's superintendence. As among the Quakers, there is no singing, which this sect considers unholy, and the prayer is said to be silent; yet they have forms of prayers prescribed by Wurz, with responses. Both at home and in their assemblies they pray before a crucifix. The notion of their assembling in the open air appears to be an error. Knaux has once

performed a christening; the form which he employed contained the Apostle's Creed, and differed from that of the Church in no essential particulars, except that the sponsors replied only with Amen. Those who enter into the sect are required to sign their names several times, and the Lord's Supper is partaken of with them. A constant correspondence is carried on with Wurz, whom the members call their father and high-priest, and not a week passes without a voluminous letter from him. He sends revelations, and writes to the members individually; they, in turn, send him reports of whatever occurs; so that he conducts the whole, receives new members, excludes such as are thought unworthy, &c. His adherents visit each other constantly, and have always friends with them. As these proceedings are rather expensive, they have given up contributing to missions, &c. Wurz is, besides, by no means favorable to missions, regarding the Missionary Society at Basle as his greatest enemies. With respect to doctrine, they maintain that it is now a time of separation, and that the Lord is gathering to himself a chosen church. To the Reformation they attach little importance, and think that Luther committed many errors. They wish to restore many Catholic observances; for instance, the adoration of the Virgin, the use of crucifixes and tapers in their devotions, the doctrine of Purgatory, &c. They have also many peculiar notions respecting the Kingdom of God, the inhabitants of the stars, &c. They formerly held Napoleon to be the Anti-Christ, and expected his resurrection; this notion they have lately abandoned. They frequently name a period, at the end of one, two or several years, when the community are to assemble in the Holy Land. They maintain, that whatever happens was foretold by Wurz, and do not allow themselves to be undeceived by the failure of many of his prophecies. In their way of life, they seclude themselves more and more from others, even from those who are most nearly connected with them. They say that

such intercourse, unless absolutely necessary, is forbidden them. They take no part in family festivals, even of a religious nature. This exclusiveness goes so far, that even among the members a distinction is made between the novices and the initiated.

[From the Christian Reformer, London, September, 1846.]

RENUNCIATION OF ORTHODOXY AT EVESHAM.

Considerable sensation has been felt in this town among the orthodox by the resignation of the Rev. J. D. Casewell, an able and popular minister of a Baptist congregation in this borough, on account of a change in his religious sentiments. His general strain of preaching was more liberal than that of his brethren, from his first settlement here about five years ago, and some of the orthodox had seceded in consequence. Lately his sentiments have undergone a decided change in favor of Unitarianism, and after hard struggles between his feelings and convictions, he resolved to follow the dictates of conscience, whatever might be the consequence. Some individual friends wished him to retain the pulpit, but he considered he had not a moral right to do so, after his change of sentiments. Mr. C. preached his last sermons to his congregation Aug. 9th, on "the paternal government of God," and "the dignity of human nature." Aug. 16th, he for the first time appeared in a Unitarian pulpit at Cheltenham, where his services were received with great approbation, and on the 20th of August he is to officiate for Mr. Jones at Northampton. At the annual meeting of the Warwickshire, &c. Tract Society, held at Northampton, August 18th, Mr. C. delivered a speech of fervid elo-

quence, describing the struggles of his own mind in the change which had taken place in his views of Christian doctrine, and expressive of the love and goodwill he retained for his former friends and connections, in language that reached the hearts of all present. The assembly was estimated at four hundred and upwards. Mr. Casewell's speech was delivered in responding to the following expressive sentiments, "Honor to those who manifest religious principle and religious consistency, and especially to those who have suffered for the cause, hearkening unto God rather than unto man."

T. D.

[From the Christian Reformer, London, September, 1846.]

GLEANINGS REGARDING RONGE.

THE important movement of which Ronge is the head, makes steady progress in Germany, daily acquiring more consistency, strength and influence. It has now been in existence long enough to prove that it is no momentary effervescence. It has survived attacks and been invigorated by opposition. Internal dissensions have been composed, though we have seen indications of vacillation on the part of Czerski, which make us think that he is open to the influence of English gold, so active on the continent for effecting conversions to orthodoxy. Time and trial have occasioned reflection, and in general the leaders now better understand both their position and their work. If the freshness of a first enthusiasm has abated, its advantages have been succeeded by a greater harmony of feeling and a greater concentration of effort; while the tendencies of the public mind are quietly but effectually working to spread and deepen the movement, and to

lead to its recognition by the civil powers. Meanwhile there are fewer wonders to recount. In regard to immediate interest, the harvest has been gathered. Gleanings only can we hope to present from time to time to the acceptance of our readers.

Among the signs of deliberate action and systematic effort, we place the establishment of a monthly periodical (Monatsschrift von A. M. Müller), the 1st No. of which appeared on January 1, of the current year. The address to the reader thus speaks:—"As a purifying fire does the thought of evangelical freedom hasten through men's minds; at every point of the Catholic Church it sets in motion that process of purification which is in accordance with the spirit of the times. The necessity of a rational reform manifests itself in living facts. For the preservation, however, of the harmony of the reformatory movements, there is need of an organ whose historical progress may systematically follow the entire interests of the new Catholic Church in its inward and outward relations. We intend to put forth an authentic reporter of the important movements which are now taking place in the Catholic Church, with a view of preventing the danger of division and anarchy."

The work is intended to be a central origin of Catholic Reform, as it is now being wrought in different parts of the world; having for its object not merely to record what is achieved, but to gather up and communicate power, as well as to advise, moderate, guide and impel. Did we possess such a representative of the every-day's proceedings of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, it would be invaluable now, and at the time of its appearance would have greatly served the cause of Christian truth and liberty.

Among the contents of the work we can mention only one or two articles. In No. I., is a valuable and appropriate essay, bearing the title, "What is the Aim of the present Church Reform?" According to

this authority, "The authors of the Reform aim not to be sectaries or originators of division, but solely to promote the pure doctrine of the Gospel, the everlasting foundation of a true universal church. For this purpose it is indispensably necessary that the people should be awakened out of their slumbers."

In the February number is a Pastoral Letter, addressed to "the German Catholic Christians:" "a word full of light, power and love." "The unhappy conviction," it is here stated, "that the Roman Church is the only medium of salvation, has to bear the blame of all the abominations which orthodoxy has inflicted on persons thinking differently from itself. Only the highest spiritual imbecility can allow itself to fall into the chains of Rome. In the Vatican, people think as they formerly thought; they understand neither the relations nor the progress of the human mind, or rather they are ignorant of both."

The April number gives a paper, the object of which is to promote a general union of friends of religious reform both in the Protestant and the Catholic Church. Citing a remark of Jean Paul, that there is a higher toleration which is the fruit not of the peace of Westphalia nor any outward thing, but of a life elevated and refined by long experience, the writer, who is a Protestant, maintains that this toleration finds truth in every opinion, beauty in every kind of beauty, and in men, nations and books, abstains from regarding the diversity and individuality of excellence as its absence. Christian toleration, in the eyes of the writer, is the recognition of different forms of opinion, resting on a faith which lives in love, and is altogether alien from any form of verbal doctrine. It recognizes that Christianity is not a complete system of religious opinion, but spirit and life — a new life which must take possession of the heart, and work for the furtherance of the kingdom of God. Union is a combination, on the ground of this toleration, of hitherto separated communities.

Union, we know, is a most praiseworthy aim, but, to be stable, it must be founded on clear and rational as well as recognized principles. Now the doctrine here laid down, if clear, is not rational, and if not rational can scarcely be clear; while so long as human nature and the New Testament remain our guides, it is not likely to be generally recognised. Toleration and union are two different things. We may be content to put up with error, because we cannot substitute truth. We may feel it our duty to hold our peace in regard to error. We are bound to practise universal charity and observe the laws of justice and honor, as much towards those who differ from, as those who think with us. But men cannot unite unless they are of one mind. Union is properly oneness of mind. And until a unity of mind is produced, outward union is nugatory. Minds that are diversely affected, must go in diverse directions, and it is far better they should be allowed to take their natural course, without any effort to compel them to pursue the same path. Unity in diversity there may be, but it is a unity of love and good-will combined with diversity of action. This unity is founded on the conviction that there is good in every thing; but it is not guilty of the blunder that in consequence every thing is good. This paralogism is at the bottom of that religious indifference which in all ages has been either the cause or the consequence of religious disbelief.

We should therefore be sorry to see any attempt on the part of the friends of progress in Germany, to combine together on a basis such as this. They may all continue to love each other; to work on in faith, hope and charity; to make the most of their points of agreement; to unite whenever and for whatever object they honestly can; but unless they have renounced all positive belief, and hold that any one opinion is as true and as good as any other — that is, unless they have thrown off the authority of Christ, without taking any other

guide, they cannot combine on the ground of an utter disregard to religious truth. Already some friends of the New Reformation have feared that they saw in Ronge tendencies towards negations which, if not changed, might end in nothing, to the grievous disappointment of some and the lasting injury of many. The Christian life cannot be sustained unless on Christian nutriment. The spirit of Christianity, without its body, has for us no real existence and can exert no permanent influence. Much as we dislike a formal creed, we dislike equally the recognition of a system of indifference, in which every thing is equal because every thing is alike unimportant. By such means the world never was and never will be reformed.

The progress of the New Reformation is not to be measured by an appeal to numbers. While the movement is spreading in most civilized countries, Germany feels its influence in all parts. Among Protestants it has its supporters in the "Friends of Light," with Ulrich at their head; and Ronge takes the lead among Catholics. Independently of these and other definite facts, there prevails in all classes of society and all communions a sympathy with the aims of the New Reformation, more or less decided in its character, which results partly from the influence of a regenerated theology, and partly from the ameliorated and softened spirit of the age. Numbers, however, are still some indication, and we therefore subjoin the latest "muster of the forces" that has come under our notice. "The German Catholic Church numbers 321 communities, of which the community at Berlin has 2250 souls; that at Brandenburg, 38; at Halle, 160; at Stettin, 140; at Halberstadt, 200; at Frankfort on the Oder, 390; at Spandau, 62; at Neu-Ruppin, 45; at Erfurt, 225; at Stolp, 45; at Potsdam, 390; at Magdeburg, 200; at Mühlhausen, 60; and at Kottbus, 30." Another account makes the number of churches to be 417. These are ministered to by 70 clergymen. From

other sources we learn that at Königsberg the German Catholic Church numbers 500 souls, being about a third of the Catholic population of the town; at Danzig, 480 members, children not included; and at Posen, 600.

While every proper means are adopted for extending in the world the influence of the principles of the New Reformation, its chief men seem to regard it as their special duty at the present moment to take steps for consolidating the churches already gathered. Accordingly, questions of practical concern — such as the forms to be observed in baptism and in the administration of the Lord's Supper — are receiving marked attention, and to all appearance with satisfactory results. Ronge himself is occupied with the preparation of a new Catechism, which is already nearly completed. We shall be disappointed if this work does not do something to answer the extravagant misrepresentation made in this country of his opinions, as if he were on the extreme verge of an anti-supernatural rationalism. We have lately seen a statement that three Scotchmen, who are visiting the German Catholic churches with a view to ascertain their actual condition, have been pleasingly surprised at the tone of doctrine which they found prevalent. How far such feelings are likely to gain prevalence with those who maintain the old forms of orthodoxy, we cannot say, but we have an assurance that the New Reformation will give increasing satisfaction to the friends of primitive Christianity. There is an obvious tendency visible in the churches towards more positive forms of opinion. We subjoin an extract from the Confession recently made in the church at Leipsic by three catechumens at their confirmation: "I believe in Jesus Christ, our Saviour, the Son of the Father, full of grace and truth, who as man lived, suffered and died. He is our purest and loftiest model, has freed us from spiritual bondage, raised us to the liberty of sons of God, has gone to the Father and

received the highest dignity in the spiritual world; he is the only Mediator between God and men, and solely through him do we go to the Father. I solemnly promise to receive his doctrine as the word of God, to follow his example in word and deed, and, in imitation of him, so to do the Divine will, that I may be one with the Father, as he himself is one with the Father. I believe in a holy universal Christian church, which embraces all men that receive and follow the doctrine of Christ, and regards as dead members those only who are devoid of love. I recognize Christ alone as the Head of the Christian church, as the sole Shepherd and Bishop of souls, whose words stand higher than the commands of men or ecclesiastical decrees. I promise to remain true to the faith of the German Catholic Church, as a member of which I will, according to my ability, labor for the furtherance, in myself and my fellow-men, of the kingdom of God; diligently employing the means provided for my improvement and elevation, so that I may make progress in truth and virtue, and, banishing all hate against those who hold different opinions from my own, live in peace and love with all men."

[From the Christian Reformer, London, September, 1846.]

CONTROVERSY ON NATIONAL EDUCATION.

CONSIDERABLE attention has been given to two series of letters on National Education now in the course of publication, the first by Mr. Edward Baines, Jun., published in his able newspaper, the *Leeds Mercury*, opposing all Government interference in popular education, and maintaining the sufficiency of

the voluntary principle to meet the growing wants of the country in respect to education; the second by Dr. Vaughan, Principal of the Lancashire Independent College, published in the *Morning Chronicle*, maintaining the utter insufficiency of all existing educational provision, and the right and duty of the Government to supply *secular* instruction to the people. So far, the advantage in the argument seems altogether on the side of Dr. Vaughan. He lays down the maxim, that "Government *may* be a moral teacher to the extent in which it *must* be a moral administrator." In the remarks which follow, taken from his second letter, Dr. Vaughan will carry with him the assent of every liberal mind amongst the Dissenters of England.

"Nor should it be forgotten that it is a new thing with Dissenters to feel any difficulty on this point. When an attempt was made some years since to secure access for Nonconformists to the means of secular education in our Universities, without obliging them to commit themselves in any way to the religious teaching of those places, no man throughout the ranks of Dissent appeared to doubt the reasonableness or practicability of such a separation of the literary and scientific from the theological. The concession was not made, and all classes of Nonconformists agreed in attributing the refusal to the narrow selfishness of the refusers. Our language was, not only that the party adverted to might have done that thing if they would, but that the plea of religion set up by them for not doing it was a worthless and hollow plea. When the London University was instituted — instituted for the purpose of imparting secular instruction, and such instruction only — Nonconformists generally gave it their approval. The cry raised against it as irreligious because not professedly religious, as 'atheistic' because not professedly Christian, all fair-minded men knew well enough how to interpret. It was regarded by Nonconformists as the bad pretext by which political partisans and Church intolerants sought to accomplish their particular ends. When the Government scheme of education for Ireland was introduced a few years ago, the Congregational Board of London and the ministers of the Three Denominations voted resolutions and presented a memorial to the Government in approbation of what was done. The cry of 'No Popery,' and 'No Atheism,' which the enemies of a Liberal Government contrived to get up on that measure, was not only spread through the

land, and proclaimed with due theatrical effect in some memorable public meetings, but was borne with no less memorable parade to the gates of Buckingham Palace, and even to the foot of the Throne! Protestant Nonconformists were observant of these very religious proceedings, and estimated them at their proper value."

Dr. Vaughan reiterates the opinion previously stated in the *British Quarterly Review*, that he entertains "a very humble opinion of the direct religious teaching which is given in day-schools, or that ever can be given in such institutions." His experience has taught him that the great benefit of such schools consists, not in any direct religious impression produced by them, but in their adaptation to prepare the young for receiving religious instruction elsewhere.

We have read with great pleasure Dr. Vaughan's letters, and trust they will be collected and published in a separate form. In respect to catholicity of spirit, they present Protestant Nonconformity in the position which we conceive it ought to take. The closing remark of the second letter especially deserves attention:

"Let the day-school inculcate a reverence of truth and justice, and a love of every thing kindly, generous and noble-hearted, and let the directly religious instruction be grafted upon such teaching, and it will be the fault of the agents, and not of the method, if you do not realize a scheme of popular education of the highest value. Nor can I doubt that an intermixture of the children of all sects in such schools would tend to abate our sectarian animosities, and render the next generation in that respect an improvement on the past."

Mr. Baines's letters are written too much in the temper excited by the obnoxious clauses of Sir James Graham's Factories' Bill.

[From the Irish Unitarian Magazine for September, 1846.]

CALL OF ABRAHAM.

Most important for mankind was the call of Abraham. It was one of those events on which human destiny is found from time to time to hinge. Idolatry was all but universal. The knowledge of the Creator had nearly vanished from the earth. Egypt, the centre of the arts and refinements of life, worshipped even the lowest animals. There it was fully proved how little man can do for himself in regard to the solemn obligations of duty, and the high hopes and destiny of the religious life. But God chose Abraham, and a new era began which will never come to an end; for Jesus finished what Abraham commenced. It is a gratifying fact, that the series of biographical pictures begins with one which is so pleasing and so ennobling as that of Abraham. Had the dispositions which actuated him been shared by all who came afterwards, we should not have found the great life-roll of humanity blotted, blurred, and disgraced by such names as Alexander, Nero, and Napoleon.

Already, at the times of Abraham, had the world made some decided progress in civilization; a knowledge of which, so far as it is definite and satisfactory, we owe to the divinely illuminated pages of the Bible. The most useful arts of life had long been invented, and were in general use. Those large societies of men which are called nations were gradually forming themselves on spots which were determined by a regard to the natural limits and advantages afforded by seas, rivers, and mountain-ranges. And, as men fixed them selves in different places up and down the earth, so did they become more and more divided from each other by the continually increasing diversity of languages, which led to other alienating diversities in social usages, and in religious opinions and observances. The first

empires were thus founded, and the great question of human education began to be seriously worked out. War had begun its desolations; slavery was quietly but effectually wasting human energies away, perverting the natural relations of life. The union of the sexes, which is the great hinge of man's highest good, was uncertain and ill-regulated. Hospitality had assumed a distinguished position, and sheds a mild lustre over these early days; but if, from such a tent as that of Abraham, we turn to the world at large, we behold scarcely any other virtue in a high condition, and such vices abounding as easy abundance and extreme leisure may produce, under the aid of burning skies, vivid imaginations, and uncontrollable passions. — *People's Dictionary of the Bible.*

[From the Christian Reformer, London, September, 1846.]

THE OXFORD CONVERTS TO POPERY.

On Sunday, June 6, no less than ten converts from the Anglican Establishment were admitted by Dr. Wiseman, at St. Mary's College, Oscott, to holy orders. Amongst them was Mr. Newman. The Church of Rome pays no heed to the pretended orders of the Church of England, but would treat even the Archbishop of Canterbury, were he to submit to the Mother Church, simply as a layman. Should he propose himself as a candidate for holy orders, he would have to commence with the humble offices of Lector and Acolyte. Mr. Newman was admitted on this occasion only to what are called "minor orders." Should he prove an obedient and quiet son of the Church, there is scarcely any distinction, short of the Pontifical chair, to which he may not hope to rise.

[From the London Inquirer, No. 216.]

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

We have reported rather fully in our present Number a public meeting held at the Crown and Anchor, on Monday evening, in futherance of the objects of the Anti-Slavery League. This new society has been formed by some of the more ardent opponents of Slavery, with an especial view to the state of things in America, and with the hope of bringing the power of public opinion, and the moral influence belonging to it, to bear so strongly on the case of American Slavery, as to contribute something to hasten its abolition. It is, in fact, a society formed under the advice of the leaders of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and expressly designed to aid it. The meeting was rendered interesting by the presence of those remarkable men, William Lloyd Garrison, Henry C. Wright, and Frederick Douglass. Their powerful and earnest appeals were listened to with deep attention; and the numerous audience, with one or two exceptions, responded warmly to the sentiments addressed to them, and the resolutions proposed for their adoption.

The peculiar view is, that the holding a fellow-man in bondage, and enforcing his unrequitted services, is, in a civilized and Christian community, a *crime of the deepest dye;* that those who are guilty of such conduct ought to be treated as criminals; and that all who sanction them, by treating them as if they had done nothing to forfeit the esteem of society — who join in church communion with them as approved Christians — or who refuse to bear open and distinct testimony against their conduct — are participators in, and encouragers of, the criminality, and ought themselves to be treated as, in other cases, the respectable part of the community treat the abettors of the crimes which disturb the public peace.

It must be confessed that this is hard doctrine; and there are many worthy and excellent people who are found unable to bear it. Our own feelings have strongly rebelled against it; but after much reflection, and some severe mental struggles, we give way to the force of the reasons alleged, and yield, we must own, a reluctant but a sincere and full assent to the principles laid down.

The difficulties raised are these: —First, The impossibility of that being treated as a *crime*, which is sanctioned by the laws of the country, in which those who commit it are living. Secondly, The excuses due to the education, prejudices, and position of the slave-holders, and to their many excellent qualities; and the deference we owe to the judgment and principles of many

able, well-informed, judicious, and excellent men, who decline to take part with the extreme anti-slavery body, and continue to hold social, friendly, and religious intercourse with slave-holders. Thirdly, The impropriety of attempting interference with the political constitution and peculiar institutions of an independent nation, in no degree under our control. And, fourthly, The harshness of the proceeding recommended, and its unavoidably *personal* character; whilst it is conceived that all that can justly be expected from us is to show our disapprobation of *the system of slavery*, and our desire to induce its upholders to put an end to it in such a manner, and at such a time, as shall seem to them safe and expedient.

Some of these difficulties we have felt strongly ourselves — others we have seen to influence benevolent men, to whom the slavery system is most abhorrent, but who think the course taken by such societies as the Anti-Slavery League, fanatical, unjustifiable, and pernicious. We will then, very shortly, give the substance of the reasons which influence our present decision in respect to each of the difficulties above referred to. And first, we think almost every one recognises the principle that the laws of the land sometimes omit to denounce, and even not unfrequently sanction, what is morally wrong; and in such a case it is only the more necessary decidedly to condemn what, in defiance of moral influences, has secured to itself the support of law. If the case were a disputable one, it would seem to be our duty to insist on the arguments which seemed to us to justify the view we adopt. But is any one to be found in a civilized country whose reason or conscience justify slavery? Men insist upon and use their *legal* rights, but they well know that in doing so they commit a great and grievous wrong. They excuse it by custom and example, and cling to it from supposed personal interest; but their hearts tell them, if they think at all, that they are guilty of a crime against their brother. The excuses founded on the natural inferiority of the enslaved race, and the alleged general kindness of their treatment, are unbearable. Abundant examples prove the negroes to be capable of attainments which would do no discredit to those who enjoy the best advantages; and studiously to keep them in ignorance, and then attribute this ignorance to deficiencies in them, is adding insult to cruelty. Besides, from the intermingling of the races, many of the slaves are nearly as white as their owners, and cannot be alleged, by the most obstinate believer in negro inferiority, to be less capable of mental or moral cultivation, than those who hold them in bondage. But granting the inferiority supposed, who could pretend that it would justify us in enslaving instead of protecting those who, on this supposition, are made by nature to a certain degree

dependent upon us? We can patiently endure the idea of our wilfully keeping in ignorance and degradation, for our own purposes, those whom we believe to be made dependent upon us for any improvement they can obtain.

There is no excuse for Slavery, and it is difficult to believe that any one does justify it to himself, except in the same way as thieves of all sorts pretend to defend their violations of the rights of others. Every slave-holder knows and feels that he holds what no human power can give him a *just* claim to, and what, notwithstanding any laws, cannot be rightfully his. There are many criminals, of various classes, of whom we may just as well say, that they have been misled by education and prejudice. It may be so, and we pity them, but we rank them among criminals, notwithstanding; and plainly mark, by our conduct towards them, our feeling of the injury and injustice of their conduct. A slave-holder is one who takes or keeps possession of a fellow-man, a brother, as the mere instrument of his will, deprived of all natural and political rights. Talk of a sheep-stealer, or a forger, as a criminal,— why either of them is innocent, compared with the man who has his brother in bondage. It is very common to speak as if the circumstances of finding ourselves, by inheritance, the possessors of slave property, put us in such a position, that we cannot justly be required to give up such property. It is, however, strictly true, that slave property is no real benefit; and it is also unquestionable, that as soon as we know that any of our inherited wealth was unjustly obtained, we are bound to give it up, at whatever cost to ourselves. This has often been done in the case of other kinds of property, and strict honesty requires it of every slave-owner. The representations that the negroes are happier as slaves than they could be otherwise, and therefore ought not to be interfered with, only show to what an extent the human mind may be perverted by prejudice.

It really is not right to reason on the subject as if there could be a doubt in any honest mind, of Slavery being a crime. It ought to be esteemed just as necessary for us elaborately to prove that murder is a crime. The law which sanctions the crime is maintained by the slave-holders, who must know that it is unjust; and the legal sanction only adds to the atrocity of the violation of natural rights. In the case of the American republic, the public recognition of the fundamental principle, that all men are by nature free and equal, is an aggravation of the offence of wilfully, by law, violating this principle, and the mode of treating and managing the slaves, and the state laws in relation to them, putting all complaints of undue severity out of the question — prove that the masters are conscious of violating the rights of humanity. Thieves are often brought up to

their employment, and learn from childhood to consider it as a fair one; most criminals find some way of satisfying their consciences for a time; but this makes no difference in the general mode of viewing their conduct. We should always regard criminals with pity, not with hatred, or scorn; but we must regard and treat them as afflicted with a grievous moral disease; to receive them as respectable members of society, is to sanction and encourage vice; and there is no case in which this is more certain and manifest, than in relation to the crime of slave-holding.

The second point has been involved with the first, and we need add but little to what has been said. Without doubt, slave-holders have often polished manners, and many generous and good feelings. There may be much about them to like, and even esteem. Let us think, however, how completely this is true of many moral profligates, who, like the slave-holders, have been early led to believe that the course they are pursuing is a natural and allowable one; but whom, nevertheless, all good men feel it a duty to discountenance. It is even true of thieves, prostitutes, and other delinquents, whom society is most interested in repressing, that their characters are far from being utterly and in all things bad; but misled, probably, by the worst early influences, by evil example, or by powerful temptation, for resisting which they had no proper preparation, they fell, and became what, whilst we pity, and would gladly save them, we must condemn, and are bound to mark with our strong disapprobation: the question is, does the crime of slave-holding demand less from us? and we cannot hesitate as to the answer. Nor can we reasonably doubt, that the determination of those who profess to have a serious regard to religion and morals, to mark with their strong disapprobation any particular offence, which, from any cause, has been treated too leniently, is a very powerful means of influencing the conduct of mankind. By the British law, to make a man a slave is felony, and within the wide domains of our empire no man can be a slave. This, all Britons take to be no more than common justice. They may pardon the existence of slavery among savages, and even regard it, in certain states of society, as a less evil than what must probably exist without it; but the upholding of slavery by civilized and Christian and free nations; the enslavement of a particular race, and its connexion with difference of color, and with alleged inferiority of intellect, is not to be pardoned; it is a great crime, and every one connected with it ought to know and feel that it is so regarded.

The great difficulty is with the case of the indirect encouragers of slavery, men who tell us they agree with us, and feel with us about its evils, but who, nevertheless, censure our prac-

tical course, maintaining that the remedies for such evils must be slow and cautious, and with the concurrence of the parties concerned, and making excuses for the guilty, as only acting on their own view in a disputed question; so that we have no right to refuse to regard them as worthy citizens and good Christians. The simple fact is, that the conduct of such persons is one of the strongest supports of Slavery, and one of the greatest obstacles to the establishment of a right feeling against it. They may be influenced by habit or by amiable and kind feelings, but they are doing the greatest possible mischief; and without separating ourselves from them by a more decided course, we despair of any change being effected. If we do not make Slavery a moral and religious question, and entirely make up our minds as to its wickedness, and absolute inconsistency with the religion of Christ, we do nothing. We should not consider as worthy of our countenance and respect, a man who excused, as necessary, forgery or theft or fraudulent dealing; and there can be no doubt that slave-holding is far more criminal than any of these. He who will have connections with those who practise these things must depend on them only, for the better part of society will have nothing to do with him, and such ought to be our course in respect to Slavery.

The objection that we have no right to interfere with an independent nation is surely a very strange one. Great Britain, as an empire, has indeed no right to dictate to other states or nations, or to call them to account for their conduct; though it may even thus remonstrate against wrong, and urge the wisdom and duty of change: but when the question is about moral influences, and expressions of opinion and feeling by any number of the inhabitants of this country, in respect to the institutions or practices of Americans, or of any other people, there is neither any power existing which can prevent it, nor would there be any justice or reason in the attempt to prevent it.

We ought to be interested in the welfare of our brethren, all the world over, and it is our duty, and a great means of usefulness, to express our feelings as to what is going on, and to endeavor to encourage whatever is good, and discountenance what is wrong. In America there has sprung up a band of men associated together as the uncompromising enemies of slavery — abused by many as fanatics, who injure and disgrace a good cause, but who, by their firmness and perseverance, have already produced important effects, and are drawing into their ranks the most earnest, sincere, and simple-minded Christians and philanthropists. If we think them right, who shall prevent our saying so, and joining together to afford them our support and sanction. This is no political action. It is altogether beyond the province of governments. It is a purely moral influence, and the only

question that can be raised is, whether it is an influence in the right direction.

We cannot wonder that many shrink from the course which obliges them to use the language of condemnation towards men whom they have many reasons to admire and love. We have shrunk from the presumption of blaming such men, and we have felt also an extreme repugnance towards any course of conduct which seems to aim at influencing by condemnation, not by pure argument, or by the spirit of love; but when we find practically that one of the greatest supports of the accursed system of slavery is the indulgence it receives from those whom the world respects, who will not take a decided course, and separate themselves from it, we feel that we are called upon, not to insult or quarrel with any man, but to withhold the marks of our confidence and regard from those who are, in our deliberate judgment, a great means of supporting a system of the miseries and abominations of which it is impossible to speak too strongly. We believe that duty demands that we give our earnest support to the Anti-Slavery League, in its endeavors to arouse, concentrate, and direct public opinion in this country; and that we are permitted to take no lower ground than that of Slavery being a great crime, and all who treat it with any indulgence making themselves partakers in the crime.

[From the Inquirer, (London) No. 218.]

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE—PRINCIPLES OF UNION.

We hold it to be a certain principle, that there can be no union among parties seriously differing in opinion, which is not founded on the concession of entire freedom and equality amongst those who unite. At the same time, there can be no union without a principle of union—some point or points of common agreement, which are thought sufficiently important to justify postponing to them, so far as certain times and places are concerned, all other questions. Let us take for example the Anti-State-Church Association. Its one great principle is, that the interference of civil government with religion is always and necessarily injurious, and ought by all proper methods to be resisted. Those who think thus, are qualified for membership, whatever their personal

view of religion may be. They may be Roman Catholics or Unitarians: nay, they may not be Christians. If having a value for religion, *as they understand it*, they believe that it ought to have no connection with State power, but to be free, and voluntarily supported, they are fit to be members of the Anti-State-Church Association, and ought to be cordially received, without any distinction, founded on their opinions in other respects. We think it is at Norwich that there is a Religious Liberty Society, to support the voluntary system, with an orthodox test of membership. The members cannot join with a heretic, even for what they acknowledge to be a good object, equally desired by both. This bigotry has done great injury to the Anti-State-Church cause. Fortunately, the National Society is under better auspices, though that has, in several instances, been on the verge of committing some act inconsistent with their principles, and which might have been productive of serious evil. Happily, there is a vigorous hand at its helm to keep it in the right course.

The Evangelical Alliance, like every other association, must have, and ought to have, some distinct object in view, and some definite principles, though we incline to believe that its projectors had by no means made up their minds what these should be. If it were only intended to cherish a spirit of union and Christian love by an harmonious assemblage, for joint religious communion of those who have many differences — then there should have been no doctrinal test whatever. Catholic and Protestant—orthodox and heterodox — should have been equally invited; all who acknowledge Christ as their Lord, and desire to promote his spirit in the world. In such a case, all attempts to mark differences should have been discountenanced; common ground must have been kept too, and only those objects have engaged attention on which all might feel equally interested. We know not that such a meeting would have had any utility. We are sure that in the present state of feeling it could not have been held; but supposing it possible, even in such a miscellaneous assemblage as that, although all possible varieties of Christian opinion must have been admitted, we apprehend that in the case of any known instance of persons leading an unchristian life seeking admission, they would, consistently and properly, have been rejected. A murderer, a thief, a notorious profligate, a slave-holder, must in consistency have been rejected from any assembly of professing Christians, and this would hardly require any formal previous notice, being obviously implied in an attempt to honor and promote Christianity. Every alliance of parties differing, implies that on certain points there may be honest difference; and leaving the members to defend their views on those points, at other times and places, in their own way, with perfect freedom, brings them together for some common object, on which they

already agree; but every religious alliance assumes certain fundamental principles of religion and morals, and, of course, excludes notorious criminals, with their upholders and patrons.

The Evangelical Alliance thought fit to assume a much narrower basis than Christianity. Its founders only sought the aid of those who believed as they do on a number of contested points. With all the parade about love, it was originally and essentially an aggressive movement against Roman Catholics. What is popularly termed Calvinistic theology is made the basis, and so narrow a spirit prevailed, that even agreement in what are called orthodox notions was to be of no avail, if priestly claims and peculiar Christian ordinances are not admitted. We do not charge the authors of the movement with illiberality. It is folly for men to complain of exclusion from societies, the objects of which they do not approve. The leaders in this business have an end in view, which they, without doubt, deem of sufficient importance to claim their best efforts, and in which they expect no sympathy, but from the classes of persons admitted by their doctrinal test. We deny the articles of that test, or some parts of them—so do the Society of Friends; then neither we nor they can be members, or desire to be members of the Alliance. It may be made a question whether any particular article of the creed was needful and wise to be established; but there can be no reasonable question that some limits were necessary, and the members were entitled to decide upon them. We do not believe that either truth or charity would be promoted by a society with such a basis as was adopted, yet the sects who met together might be improved in temper towards one another, and would hardly increase in bitterness towards others. But it is made a question, whether this assembly had a right to take up the question of Slavery, it not being introduced into their declaration of opinions.

The question merges in that whether Slavery is or is not *a crime*,— whether it is or is not consistent with Christianity—with its precepts fairly applied, its spirit properly carried out. The Evangelical Alliance professes to be an assembly of Christians. Had any notorious criminal, or profligate, presented himself for admission, he would unquestionably have been told that he had no business there, although the rules contained no specific reference to his conduct; what is contended is, simply, that no offence against Christian morals is more certain than slave-holding,—that the encouragement or indulgence of no crime is more injurious to Christianity than that of slave-holding; and, therefore, that a Christian assembly, which saw any danger of slave-holders or their friends intruding into it, is bound to take measures for keeping itself uncontaminated.

We regret to be called upon to give the opinion that the resolution first sanctioned by the Evangelical Alliance in relation to

Slavery, namely, the words—"And in respect especially to the system of Slavery, and every other form of oppression in any country, the Alliance are unanimous in deploring them, as in many ways obstructing the progress of the gospel; and express their confidence, that no branch will admit to membership, slaveholders, who, by their own fault, continue in that position, retaining their fellow-men in slavery, from regard to their own interests,"—can be accounted no better than a mean compromise, and an unprincipled suppression of the truth upon the subject; and that the withdrawal of even this, when found to be offensive to the Americans, was a sacrifice of the moral influence of Christianity to a show of union, for which no justification can possibly be offered.

It plainly appears by their conduct, that though the members of the Alliance greatly value a Calvinistic creed, they have no equal value for the practical principles of Christian morality. We should like to see an Alliance of Christians entirely without a doctrinal creed, expressly for the purpose of enforcing Christian morals, and acting together against the vices and evil principles most opposed to the Gospel. An Alliance in which there should not be a word said about orthodoxy or heresy, but in which the abolition of Slavery, the promotion of permanent and universal peace, the sacredness of human life, and the evils of death-punishment, the cause of temperance, and that of education, and the suppression of certain prevalent vices which are the bane of society, should form the subjects of discussion, and the objects of common interest. That we should call a Christian Alliance. We should call it so, even if some men chose to enter it, and met with no opposition, who deny altogether the divine authority of the Gospel; for there, we believe, the spirit of Christ would be; and by such means the grand ends of Christ's mission would, we are persuaded, be promoted. Possibly, however, these various objects are best promoted by separate societies.

Those who agree in thinking anything wrong in opinion or practice in the world, or who have any opinion which they cherish as important truth, do well to unite in such a manner as to use the least possible restraint, and obtain social co-operation at the least cost. The world will sift the principles thus forced on their notice; and the progress of truth and goodness must be the result. Wrong principles will only discredit themselves by the attempt to increase their influence; and we believe the Evangelical Alliance will not support the wavering credit of the dogmas it professes. Probably the pitiable exhibitions which some individuals made, and the compromises into which well-intentioned men were seduced, may serve yet further to shake confidence in a bad system, and promote indirectly the cause of Christian reformation.

[From the Inquirer, (London) No. 219.]

ELEVATION OF THE EDUCATOR.

It is natural enough to remark, that the educator ought to enjoy a higher position in society than he actually does; that parents ought to hold him in higher estimation, to be less grudging in their returns for his services, and to show more clearly their sense of his influence on their children's happiness. This is true, and has been often said, but with little effect. Some practical measures are needed to raise the position of the teacher, and none has been thought of more effectual than that of giving the public some security against ignorant pretenders, and affording encouragement to young men to devote themselves to education as a profession, by having some public and recognized test of acquirements, and by men entering the profession by a regular known channel. At present the scholastic profession is hardly recognized as distinct. It is very natural, and by no means undesirable, that Christian ministers, when not too closely occupied by the duties of their office, or when obliged to seek additional support, in consequence of their insufficient remuneration, should engage in an employment for which their education must have done much to prepare them, and which is more congenial with their pursuits and habits of mind, than any other they could undertake; but this applies only to schools of a certain class, and in limited number, and beyond this limit the public are left to their own judgment of the individual who offers his services in the most important of all capacities, with no security against incompetence and imposture. There are, notwithstanding, a great many very good teachers; but there are also many who are unworthy of any confidence; and the position of the best is greatly injured by the notoriety of the precautions needed against the unworthy.

It has hitherto seemed as if the employment of a schoolmaster was the natural resource of all who are fit for nothing else, or who have been unsuccessful in other business. Pursuits the most discordant have sent their contributions to the body; and it must be confessed that schoolmasters cannot hold the position which the public interest require that they should hold, until there is some test of their possessing adequate acquirements, and some regular mode of entering the profession, which gives a distinct standing in society.

In order to supply this great deficiency, a plan has been proposed for a College of Preceptors. The objects are at once to guarantee to the public competent teachers, and to elevate schoolmasters as a class, to a degree of respectability not yet attained. The goodness of the objects we can hardly suppose to be questioned. Can better means be pointed out? The great advantage of the plan proposed is, that it does not interfere with the present system of private schools. It enforces no uniformity of plan, and leaves to the parent his free choice as to the kind of school he will have recourse to, and his natural influence over the teacher, whilst it affords as good a security as any national system could give, of the master being duly prepared for his employment, and equal to its duties. Having an insurmountable aversion to a uniform established system of education, joined to a deep sense of the importance of something being immediately done to raise the general qualifications of teachers, we cannot withhold our approbation from a plan which provides all that is needed for public protection, not only without improper interference, but with great advantage to the preceptor as well as to the parent.

What is proposed is, to establish a College of Preceptors, which it is considered desirable, as speedily as possible, to make an authorized incorporated body, but which, in the mean time, will act on its own responsibility. It is proposed that proper tests of qualification

be determined upon in the several departments of instruction, and that persons presenting themselves shall, after examination, receive certificates or diplomas, expressing the class of teachers to which they belong. There will, we presume, be no interference whatever with religious opinions. It may justly be expected, that being a member of the College of Preceptors, will at once be regarded as a high recommendation, and that it will very soon come to be required in all persons undertaking the business of education, in the same way as having passed certain examinations is now required from those entering the medical profession.

We believe that respectable schoolmasters will find their advantage in immediately enrolling themselves as members of the College of Preceptors, which they are enabled to do by a small annual payment, and will thus contribute to raise the character and position of their profession; and we would strongly recommend to them to require their assistants to be associates of the college, and to have passed the examination proper to their rank and pretensions. It would appear that the educator, if he would raise himself in public estimation and influence, must adopt measures himself for his own security. He must provide the proofs of his having prepared himself for his profession, and must unite with his brethren to uphold its importance and dignity. We have lying before us a pamphlet, entitled, "Origin, Objects, and Transactions of the College of Preceptors," published by Rolfe and Fletcher, 15, Cloak-lane, which contains the details of the plan to which we would call the serious attention of all who are interested in the improvement of education.

[From the Irish Unitarian Magazine for September, 1846.]

RENUNCIATION OF TRINITARIANISM.

On the evening of Sunday, the 17th ult. the Rev. Robert Hassall, formerly a preacher of the Methodist New Connexion, made a statement of the reasons which induced him to reject the doctrine of the Trinity, in the Unitarian Church in this city. The Rev. gentleman chose for his text John viii. 14, "Though I bear record of myself, yet my record is true." He stated in the first place what his views had been respecting the doctrine of the Trinity, and what views he had adopted since he had rejected that doctrine. He then stated how he was led to the inquiry which terminated in a change of his opinions, and concluded by alluding to the influence which that change had upon his character and happiness.

Mr. Hassall is an Englishman and a native of Staffordshire, and was deeply impressed with the importance of religion very early in life. He entered upon a course of study preparatory to his undertaking the duties of a preacher of the Gospel, under the superintendence of a venerable aged minister of the Methodist New Connexion. Whilst pursuing his studies, he felt the want of evidence in the Bible to sustain the doctrine of the Trinity. He was struck with the fact, that nowhere in the four Gospels is it recorded that Christ taught, or even once named, the doctrine of a tri-personal Deity. For some time he was disturbed in mind, read several books in support of the Trinity, and a small work of Dr. Carpenter's in refutation of that doctrine. Not being able to find such kind of proof as he was searching for, he finally came to the conclusion that though the doctrine of the Trinity was unsupported by proof positive, it was nevertheless capable of being sustained by a chain of inferential argument. This settled his mind for the time, and he resolved to receive the dogma as an admitted truth, and as an essential part of the

Christian's faith. How his mind was again brought to the consideration of this subject, after a lapse of years, is stated by himself in the following words: —

"One day (oh I shall never forget it) whilst engaged in prayer to God with more than usual earnestness for the outpouring of his blessing upon me and the church, I was perplexed beyond description (as many others have been) in endeavoring to address the triune God, or, in other words, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. My faith taught me that each Person of the Trinity was an object of worship, inasmuch as each person was God; yet I found that I could not worship one person without separating it in my mind from the other two. But I knew, if I divided them, I should make three objects of worship; and I knew too, that if I worshipped one person, that would only be a part or third of the Divinity. Still I found it impossible so to unite the three persons in one, as to worship the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit at the same time, or the Son and the Father at the same time. I say I found it impossible to do it, and I defy any human being under heaven to do it. If there be three persons in the Deity, we can render supreme worship to one only at a time. From the constitution of the mind, it is impossible to do otherwise. Thus, then, I felt myself situated. I became agitated; I rose from my knees, and, in a state of confusion and perplexity, paced my room backwards and forwards. Question after question respecting my faith occurred to my mind. Can the Divine Being, I asked myself, be what I believe him to be? Is he divided into three persons called Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? Is the being of supreme worship such a one as to perplex the mind of the sincere worshipper? I doubted it. It appeared to me to be impossible. I resolved again, then, to examine the evidence of Scripture for the doctrine of the Trinity. That examination I believe was impartial, conducted with a simple desire for the truth. I read my Bible, and the best works I could find both for and against the doctrine; and the conclusion to which I felt myself obliged to come, as I have stated before, was, that it was not scriptural." — *Montreal Bible Christian.*

THE MOSAIC CONSTITUTION.

THE choice of an agricultural constitution, on the part of Moses, had this advantage, that it effectually served one great instrumental purpose which he had in

view; namely, the severing of his people from the idolatrous nations into the midst of whom they were going, and by whom they would, unavoidably, and for many ages, be surrounded. The country, too, was eminently fitted to give scope and opportunity to the resources of agriculture. Its position on the globe is such as to secure a full supply of heat, while the proximity of the Mediterranean Sea tends to mitigate its fervors. Lebanon covered the land from the cold winds of the north. Other hills gave shelter, and formed warm vales; while they themselves afforded pasturage for cattle, and, by means of terraces, soil for culture under different degrees of heat. A large river runs through the length of the land, and is fed by many tributary streams; other rivulets cut Palestine from east to west, flowing from the hills into the Mediterranean. The rocky (limestone) nature of the land gave an abundance of fountains and brooks. The dews are heavy. Rain falls plentifully in the opening and in the decline of the year. All these advantages contributed to make Isaac's wish a reality:—"God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine." (Gen. xxvii. 28; comp. Deut. viii. 7, *seq.*) No real objection to this account can be drawn from the actual condition of Palestine. Its civil history accounts for its actual unproductiveness. The sword is a bad substitute for the plough. Tyranny and oppression inevitably produce a desert. It was a nation of freemen that, under Mosaism, made the entire land a garden. A nation of bondmen could do no other than make it and keep it barren and desolate. Yet, wherever due care is now applied, ample proofs are given that the Land of Promise might again produce the richest rewards of human labor.—*People's Dictionary of the Bible.*

THE

UNITARIAN.

[From the Inquirer, (London,) Sept. 26, 1846.]

IRELAND AND THE POTATO DISEASE.

Some persons have had the blasphemous folly to talk of the potato disease as a judgment of God against the endowment of Popery. It is not worth while either to censure or refute them. Others have suggested, that, *if they could believe* in a particular Providence, they should suppose the blight to be sent for the purpose of teaching the Irish people to desire and seek better food. If they could believe in a particular Providence! — are not such persons led by the double sense of a word into apparently denying one of the great influential truths of practical religion? When a *particular* Providence is used to express a Providence which specially cares for an individual and his wants, whilst it leaves the greater number to their own resources, it is a dream of fanaticism, of which the well-known story of Huntingdon and his nether garments might almost be considered as a *reductio ad absurdum* — which at any rate it would be a waste of words for us to

condemn or refute. But when the phrase, "a particular Providence," is employed, as it also often is, to express a Providence extending to even the most minute particulars in the affairs of the universe, when it is really equivalent to a *universal* Providence, it is one of the most sublime conceptions of enlightened philosophy — one of the most practically important truths of Divine religion. We shall not stop here to produce evidence in its favor from revealed instructions, nor to defend it against the difficulties which may very possibly occur to some minds. But we acknowledge without hesitation our belief in it, on the united testimony of Natural and Revealed religion. We believe that all things are ordained by Supreme Wisdom, and are accomplishing the plans of boundless power and infinite benevolence. We believe that every event has its mission, and that if we listen to and obey the lessons which passing circumstances convey to those whose ears are opened to their voice, we shall be ever learning wisdom, virtue, and improvement.

The potato blight is not sent by God, in a different sense from that in which all events, whether we call them good or evil, are sent and appointed by him; but it has been sent — it is his work; and we are not to murmur at, but to improve, his appointment. Unquestionably the great body of the Irish people have been led to depend far too much upon the potato, and that must be accounted a great benefit which should lead them to rely on other and better resources. It is probable, too, that such is the strength of their habits and prejudices, that nothing less than the destruction of the potato-crop, and that even for successive years, would be sufficient to bring about any speedy change. The potato is not, as is often represented, a *bad* article of food. It contains the various essentials of whole-

some nourishment in greater proportion than some things which we yet consume with advantage, and in a form very generally agreeable. It is more like bread in its character of general acceptableness and wholesomeness than perhaps any other article in use; and we should be sorry indeed to think that the country was to be deprived of it. The present aspect of things, however, makes it highly important, both to find immediate supplies of food to take the place of what is lost, and to provide permanent substitutes, which shall make us less exclusively dependent on the potato-crop for the future.

In endeavoring to provide for the extraordinary emergency which has occurred, her Majesty's Government have most wisely bestowed their care in securing profitable employment for the people, so as to ensure their possessing the means of purchase, rather than in actually procuring supplies of food. They know with what confidence they can depend on private enterprise for conveying food, if there be only a prospect of its meeting with sale. They know that the Legislature has already done what can be done to remove impediments to its being obtained at a fair price; and they perceive that *any* attempt on the part of Government to give away, or sell at a low price, food purchased for the purpose at the public expense, besides the certainty of extensive imposition, would have the necessary effect of driving the mere trader out of the market, and would therefore practically amount to undertaking the whole responsibility of ensuring a sufficient supply. The means resorted to for promoting employment among the people, will doubtless be, to a great extent, effectual; and if people are earning fair wages, their own interest will induce merchants to look well to the supply of the cheaper forms of food which can be obtained by importation. The

importance of Indian corn in this case is incalculable, and we earnestly hope that the people will form such an attachment to it, by experiencing its good qualities, and learning to use it in the ways in which it is most agreeable, that a permanent demand for it will arise.

Of the substitutes for the potato proposed for home cultivation, beet and Jerusalem artichoke are the most promising; but though both are valuable, and may be very cheap, we do not anticipate their superseding the potato when it can be procured. It is worth considering how far certain abundant tropical productions, as yams, plantains, and cassava, for example, could be imported cheaply and abundantly, so as to increase the quantity and variety of food. In the mean time there is not a single moment to be lost in bringing into full action the means of employment; and we would add, that as, under such new and awful circumstances, it is impossible to be sure of all being sufficiently able to provide for themselves, a large amount of charitable contribution is also required; and, the resources of Ireland being already pressed upon to the utmost, the case is one in which assistance from the sister-island may be most reasonably reckoned upon.

In former years of famine and contagion, when, however, the evil was as nothing compared with that which now threatens, meetings were held all over England, and very large sums were contributed. Something of this kind is now absolutely required, in order to avert misery that we can scarcely bear to contemplate, even in imagination. We observe with great pleasure, that Dr. Smith, a dignified Roman Catholic Clergyman, is commencing, in the metropolis, a tour of preaching, and making collections in behalf of the distressed Irish, placing the proceeds of his collections at the disposal of the

Dublin Relief Committee. This is well, and English benevolence, which extends the ready hand to relieve distress in the most distant parts of the globe, will not slumber when the aid asked for is in behalf of countrymen and neighbors. We are sure that not only will Dr. Smith reap an ample harvest, but he will lead to the organization of more extended efforts, and large sums will be ready to avert the evils of famine and pestilence. Was ever a Mansion-house meeting more urgently called for?

The resort to charity is, in itself, an evil; but it is decidedly a less evil than throwing the supply of the country on the Government. And although, from the extent of the calamity which calls for our exertions, much must be wanted, the abundance of employment will cause less to be needed in each locality than on former occasions; so that, by a suitable effort, it may be possible to prevent any serious amount of suffering, and to assist the mass of the Irish people in working their way to a permanently improved condition.

With deep regret, we observe an increasing tendency to riot and violence throughout Ireland. Such want as is now felt and anticipated affords more excuse for acts of insubordination than anything else; yet, as they incalculably increase the evil which impels to them, no effort should be spared to guard against them. Employment is the best, indeed the only, remedy, and a heavy responsibility attaches to every hour's delay in furnishing it. All the parties concerned should take their measures with the utmost promptitude. In the mean time, we are confident that the utmost influence of the priests and the political leaders of all parties will be exerted to maintain order, and to encourage the patience under unavoidable suffering, for which the people have been so deservedly praised.

It is no light affliction which now hangs over Ireland; but it is within the reach of human effort to alleviate it, and it may be destined by Providence to lead the way to a permanent and important improvement. Let the works now to be engaged in be only judiciously chosen; and whilst they supply the present need, they will increase the produce of the country, facilitate intercourse between its different parts, and greatly enlarge the means of profitably employing labor in future years. Add to this, the people learning to value a more varied and higher food, and the prospect which opens to us may well reconcile us to the necessary exertions and sacrifices of the present season.

[From the Inquirer, (London,) Sept. 1846.]

BIOGRAPHY AND JOHN MILTON.

FRIEND EDITOR, — Having formerly been (in the days of my vanity) connected with thy people, but now one of the "*Friends*" — called Quakers by those not of us — I still have, through weakness, I suppose, somewhat of a sneaking kindness to thee and thine. I still get a kind of "Peeping-Tom" look into thy INQUIRER, having, I fear, a spice of curiosity of the old Adam remaining in me; and I may be tempted, perhaps, now and then, to add one more to the number of thy troublesome correspondents, when I think a hint desirable in aid of thy proprieties and discretion, or fancy I have something to communicate that may profit or please thy readers. Original papers, I suppose, friend Editor, are generally most

acceptable to thee and thy readers; but it should be borne in mind by bookish people, that things profitable and pleasing may be drawn from their reading habits, and, as a communication to thy journal, give others as well as themselves an opportunity of interesting and instructive comparison of heads and hearts, in former times, with those of the present day. I dip into *history*, now and then, though suspecting my motive to be not much better than that of many others in such reading,—namely, indulging to the same *curiosity* alluded to above. But, as a member of the Society of Friends, (the friends of peace especially,) the bloody page of history, and its frightful phase of war, is viewed with horror; and other objections of a moral nature, combined with the impression of the historian's ignorance, prejudices, partisanship, and passion, cause me to esteem and affect history not overmuch. But, not to say with one of thy shrewd and saucy writers, "Anything but history, for that I know to be false," I may say, with only too much truth, that it should not be the idol-reading which many make it. It is but fancifully the "exemplification of philosophy" which oratory makes it to be. I cannot read it as the mirror of moral truth, of human nature as it is, and the general man; and by no means a faithful glass of the economy of sublunary things in its morale and policy, a true tale of which would have added much to the edifying usefulness of the historian. As it is not a true guide, it should not be the instructor of youth, and is fitted to amuse, rather than enlighten the adult and the aged. Can it be controverted, friend Editor, that *all history* is (from the very nature of human evidence and testimony) more or less uncertain and equivocal in its narrative of facts,—surface-observed and one-sided in all its statements,—always fallible and often foolish in its reasonings,

because the reasonings of a party-man, prejudiced and passionate perhaps, ill-informed or misinformed; so that its much boasted "*philosophy*" is seldom more than the speculations of such a man on the hidden springs and movements of human nature, which lie at the base of mortal matters, but which the historian only guesses at. I beg thy aid, friend Editor, to disabuse our human brethren, and help me to break the historian's spell, as thou wouldst any wicked enchanter's wand, who cozens, deludes and holds enthralled silly minds with magic words, and glozing greatness, and cheating glory; and if thou art not ready to join me in wishing all record of the *past* sunk in "*Lethe*," thou wilt not differ widely from me in condemning history as giving a perverted view of man, and mind, and morals, — as fostering and perpetuating prejudices and false views, which have gulled and blinded human beings, and cursed the earth most preëminently, — and that the historian's page should be deemed last in the list of useful reading, if we would value at all the possession of a religious faith, a sentiment of piety to God, or of benevolence to man. So that, friend Editor, though one likes, as one's own mother's son, to know a little of the old world (or, rather, the world's younger days) — and even a plain drab and a broad brim is pleased to find himself, by the historian's aid, elbowing great folks in courts, and councils, and cabinets, and camps — still I greatly prefer biography to history, and especially what thy people call autobiography — a somewhat heathenish word, whose respective parts remind me of the classical vanities of my early days and former connections. And though my present "*Friends*," as thou knowest, do not particularly affect such heathen vanities, nor, indeed, generally, the grammatical niceties of speech and language, I cannot, for my own part, be

quite off with my "old love, though on with a new." And perhaps, friend Editor, it may be as well for one's own mental credit not to forget entirely what those big men of old thought, and said, and did, of which I still think we have a fine reflection in their classic language and writings; and, certainly, I should be pleased to see, in my present connection, an education and reading more accordant with my own impression of the men and things of a far-gone age. And when we reflect, friend, on the wonders of intellectual developement, combined with the generous and expansive spirit of Christian faith and truth of our own times, and, comparing with the past, consider that, though there was so much of grandeur and beauty in the mind of the ancient world, they had a polytheism and mythology (intellectually and spiritually) so debasing and pernicious, we might, if seriously thoughtful, appreciate Christianity more justly, and possess it more thankfully; with an increased power of conviction, we might rest in the great conclusion, that the *religious principle* is the grand element and base of man's dignity, refinement and happiness,—that his virtue and welfare will ever essentially be involved in its pure and perfect developement,—while this truth will rise upon him with added light and force in each coming age, that the full and final exposition of the religious principle and sentiment is no other than the Divine teaching of the Christian record.

But I am losing sight of thee, friend Editor, and of my chief object in troubling thee. It is to introduce to thy notice, and that of thy readers, an "autobiography" (as thou callest it) of some interest and merit, and, perhaps, not known to thee. An expression occurs to me at this moment, (friend Johnson's, I think—"Brave Samuel, the Dictionary-man," as Thomas Carlyle somewhere calls him,)

"Every man has something to tell of himself worth knowing," had he but the cunning ability to tell it well, or, what is better, to interest and profit others, a simple, sincere, single-mindedness, and an earnest, affectionate spirit, that might impart a charm to a picture of the humblest mind; and what the interest and value might be, and is, in some special memoirs, may be seen, thou knowest, most eloquently set forth in friend "Foster's Essay on Autobiography." I need not tell thee, friend Editor, that any individual man is mainly and essentially an exponent or representative of his kind; and I cannot but think that a faithful and attractive memoir of the individual may be, and is, (in respect of interesting and instructive matter and meaning,) worth all the boasted wisdom and philosophy of history, — all the grave reasonings and ostentation of eloquence and oratory in the historian. In introducing thee to the "Autobiography" of Thomas Ellwood, it is sufficient to interest thee to observe, that the said Thomas Ellwood was a scholar of John Milton, and learnt Latin of him. The little book is called "The History of the Life of Thomas Ellwood, written by Himself." "By faith, the elders obtained a good report;" and truly, friend Editor, is this plain, simple Quaker biography an exposition of the necessity of "*faith*" for man, and of the power of faith to give strength and beauty to his character, to inspire his soul with a good and great aim, to suggest the true and right method and motive, to sustain a brave heart in its resolute courage and perseverance, and bear the man, and the martyr, perhaps, triumphantly onward to the goal and the crown. In some affecting piece of biography, (more than in history,) friend Editor, it is often much more clearly and effectively borne in upon the student's mind and heart, that if a man has *not* the aid and impulse of

some high and holy faith in his soul — that is, a belief in and aspiration after some grand invisible realities, some pure, noble, and generous convictions and sentiments, inspired by views out of and above himself, and stretching to the Infinite and Eternal; in plainer terms, some thoughts, and views and impressions arising from high and honorable conceptions of God and man, that the Creator is all glorious and good, and the creature man his loving charge and care — I say, friend, that biography (better than history) often teaches us that, without some such faith, the human mind is empty and worthless, as it were, and human character a bubble, — without means or motive, so to speak, to anything great or good, — with neither capability nor object to inspire noble conceptions or pure desires, or give impulse to virtuous daring; it has no real basis of high thoughts or brave deeds, can feel no efficient motive for self-sacrifice, devoted duty, benevolent labor, or to suffer and die for conscience' sake, for truth and virtue. And now indulge me, respected friend, once more, in observing to thy readers, that in conceiving of an *appropriate faith* for this mental and moral movement, I do not say that, if we were ignorant of Christianity, the divine doctrines and objects of Christian faith would suggest themselves to the thinking man; but, happy as we are in the knowledge of Christianity, I may affirm the impossibility of conceiving anything more suitable, anything better or essentially differing from the revealings of the Christian faith, to inspire and prompt the above spirit of human life, duty, virtue, and happiness.

A brief preface to the memoir in question observes: — "The autobiography of Thomas Ellwood would deserve a place in any collection, were it nothing more than an unsophisticated record of the operation of a new principle of faith and conscience

upon an ingenious and enthusiastic mind. Its claim upon the attention of the student of human character, in all its diversities, is, however, much enhanced by the proofs which it affords of the folly and cruelty of religious persecution, as well as by much curious matter in illustration of the early progress and proceedings of the remarkable body to whom the writer (by conversion) belonged. Like William Penn, a gentleman by birth, and brought up in notions altogether repugnant to the new doctrines which he embraced; the rapid and decided manner in which he appears to have made up his mind, and his conscientious encounter of the difficulties and hardships which ensued from parental anger, and consequent poverty, render Ellwood a highly interesting character. Nor is that interest at all decreased by the harmless and unconscious vanity which now and then pervades the narrative in respect to the author's argumentative and poetical powers. The temporary connection of Ellwood with the poet Milton also, and the curious fact that a casual remark of his led to the production of 'Paradise Regained,' give additional value to a fragment so essentially characteristic."—(Vide "Introduction to the History of the Life of Thomas Ellwood: written by himself." London, 1827. Printed for Hunt and Clarke, York-street, Covent-garden.)

However interesting and instructive I may deem this little book, (and, possibly, as one of the Society of Friends, or Quakers, as thy people call us, I may overrate it,) I must not risk wearing thyself and thy readers by any other extracts than those in which is found a mention of John Milton.

At page 92 of his Memoirs, Thomas Ellwood says,—"I mentioned before, that when I was a boy, I had made some good progress in learning, and lost it all again before I came to be a man; nor

was I rightly sensible of my loss therein, until I came amongst the Quakers. But when I both saw my loss and lamented it, I applied myself with the utmost diligence, at all leisure times, to recover it; so false I found that charge to be which, in those times, (John Milton's 'Evil Times,') was cast as a reproach upon the Quakers, that they despised and decried all human learning, because they denied it to be essentially necessary to a Gospel ministry; which was one of the controversies of those times. But though I toiled hard, and spared no pains to regain what once I had been master of, yet I found it a matter of so great difficulty, that I was ready to say, (as the noble treasurer of Ethiopia did to Philip, in another case,) 'How can I, unless I had some man to guide me?' This I had formerly complained of to my especial friend Isaac Penington, but now more earnestly, which put him upon considering and contriving a means for my assistance. He had an intimate acquaintance with Dr. Paget, a physician of note, in London, and he with John Milton, a gentleman of great note for learning throughout the learned world, and for the accurate pieces he had written on various subjects and occasions. This person, having filled a public station in the former times, lived now a private and retired life in London; and, having wholly lost his sight, kept always a man to read to him, who usually was the son of some gentleman of his acquaintance, whom, in kindness, he took to improve in his learning. Thus, by the mediation of my friend, Isaac Penington, with Dr. Paget, and Dr. Paget with John Milton, was I admitted to come to him, not as a servant to him, (which at that time he needed not,) nor to be in the house with him, but only to have the liberty of coming to his house at certain hours, when I would, and to read to him what books he

should appoint me, which was all the favor I desired."

But, before this took place, Thomas Ellwood returned to his father's house, in Oxfordshire, where he fell ill of the small-pox. After his recovery, he hastened back to London; and, as his sure friend, Isaac Penington, had mediated successfully for his admittance to John Milton, that he might come when he would, "I went, in the first place, (says our biographer,) to wait upon him. He received me courteously, as well for the sake of Dr. Paget, who introduced me, as of Isaac Penington, who recommended me, to both of whom he bore a good respect. And, having inquired divers things of me, with respect to my former progression in learning, he dismissed me, to provide myself such accommodations as might be most suitable to my future studies. I went, therefore, and took myself a lodging as near to his house, which was then in Jewin-street, as conveniently I could; and, from thenceforward, went every day, in the afternoon, except on the first-days of the week; and, sitting by him, in his dining-room, read to him in such books, in the Latin tongue, as he pleased to hear me read. At my first sitting to read to him, observing that I used the English pronunciation, he told me, if I would have the benefit of the Latin tongue, not only to read and understand the Latin authors, but to converse with foreigners, either at home or abroad, I must learn the foreign pronunciation. To this I consenting, he instructed me how to sound the vowels; so different from the common pronunciation used by the English, who speak *Anglice* their Latin, that (with some few other variations in sounding some consonants, in particular cases, a *c* before *e* or *i*, like *ch*; *sc* before *i*, like *sh*, &c.,) the Latin thus spoken seemed as different from that which was delivered

as the English generally speak it, as if it were another language. I had before, during my retired life at my father's, by unwearied diligence and industry, so far recovered the rules of grammar, in which I had once been very ready, that I could both read a Latin author, and, after a sort, hammer out his meaning. But this change of pronunciation proved a new difficulty to me. It was now harder for me to read than it was before to understand when read. But '*Labor omnia vincit — Improbus*' —

> 'Incessant pains
> The end obtains.'

And so did I; which made my reading the more acceptable to my master. He, on the other hand, perceiving with what earnest desire I pursued learning, gave me not only all the encouragement, but all the help he could. For, having a curious ear, he understood by my tone when I understood what I read and when I did not; and, accordingly, would stop me, examine me, and open the most difficult passages to me. Thus I went on for about six weeks' time, reading to him in the afternoons, and exercising myself with my own books in my chamber in the forenoons. I was sensible of an improvement. But, alas! I had fixed my studies in a wrong place. London and I could never agree for health; my lungs, I suppose, were too tender to bear the sulphurous air of that city, so that I soon began to droop; and, in less than two months' time, I was fain to leave both my studies and the city, and return into the country to preserve life; and much ado I had to get thither."

Thomas Ellwood recovered, at last, from a severe illness, of which he says, — "The Lord was both gracious to me in my illness, and was pleased to raise me up again, that I might serve him in my

generation. As soon as I had recovered so much strength as to be fit to travel, I took leave of my friends, and returned to my studies in London. I was very kindly received by my master, who had conceived so good an opinion of me, that my conversation, I found, was acceptable to him, and he seemed heartily glad of my recovery and return; and into our old method of study we fell again; I reading to him, and he explaining to me, as occasion required. But, as if learning had been a forbidden fruit to me, scarce was I well settled in my work, before I met with another diversion, which turned me quite out of my work. For a sudden storm arising, from I know not what a surmise of a plot, and thereby danger to the Government; and the meetings of dissenters, (such, I mean, as could be found, which, perhaps, were not many besides the Quakers,) were broken up throughout the city, and the prisons mostly filled with our friends."

After enduring two imprisonments, Thomas Ellwood, in a subsequent part of his narrative, thus relates: — "Some little time before I went to Aylesbury prison, I was desired by my *quondam* master, Milton, to take a house for him in the neighborhood where I dwelt, that he might go out of the city, for the safety of himself and his family, the pestilence then growing hot in London. I took a pretty box for him in Giles Chalfort, a mile from me, of which I gave him notice, and intended to wait on him, and see him well settled in it, but was prevented by that imprisonment. But now being released, and returned home, I soon made a visit to him, to welcome him into the country. After some common discourse had passed between us, he called for a manuscript of his, which being brought, he delivered to me, bidding me take it home with me, and read it at my leisure; and when I had done so, return it to him with my judgment thereupon. When I came home,

and had set myself to read it, I found that it was that excellent poem entitled 'Paradise Lost.' After I had, with the best attention, read it through, I made him another visit, and returned him his book, with due acknowledgement of the favor he had done me in communicating it to me. He asked me how I liked it, and what I thought of it; which I modestly but freely told him; and, after some further discourse about it, I pleasantly said to him, 'Thou hast said much here of Paradise *lost*, but what hast thou to say of Paradise *found?*' He made me no answer, but sat some time in a muse, then brake off that discourse, and fell upon another subject. After the sickness was over, and the city well cleansed, and become safely habitable again, he returned thither. And when, afterwards, I went to wait on him there, which I seldom failed of doing whenever my occasions drew me to London, he showed me his second poem, called 'Paradise Regained;' and, in a pleasant tone, said, 'This is owing to you, for you put it into my head by the question you put to me at Chalfont, which before I had not thought of.'"

I will favor thee, friend Editor, with a modicum of Thomas Ellwood's poetry, to vary a little my extracts; it is simple and homely, but not without significance and instruction; and perhaps will not be less interesting to thee and thy readers, for somewhat of a Quaker air and cut of preciseness and formality. He says, — "The prison-door being then set open for us, we went out, and departed to our respective homes. But before I left the prison, considering one day with myself the different kinds of liberty and confinement, freedom and bondage, I took my pen, and wrote the following enigma, or riddle:—

Lo! here a riddle to the wise,
In which a mystery there lies;
Read it therefore with that eye
Which can discern a mystery.

THE RIDDLE.

Some men are free, while they in prison lie;
Others, who ne'er saw prison, captives die.

CAUTION.

He that can receive it may;
He that cannot, let him say,
And not be hasty, but suspend
His judgment, till he sees the end.

SOLUTION.

He only 's free indeed, that 's free from sin,
And he is fastest bound, that 's bound therein.

CONCLUSION.

This is the liberty I chiefly prize,
The other, without this, I can despise."

Friend Thomas, thou rememberest, was a *convert* to the faith and practice of our people, who, thou knowest, are not much given to poetic vanities, like thine; eschewing especially the somewhat pagan and heathen babblings of riddles, oracles, mysteries, or puzzles, and conundrums, as thou, friend, callest them. He must be forgiven, on the ground of a little of the former man still clinging to him.

Here then, friend Editor, I conclude for the present, with observing, that the whole of Thomas Ellwood's autobiography is pleasingly interesting and instructive: it is just quaint enough to make it agreeably peculiar and characterly; and also stirring and bustling enough to stand out in rather bold relief from the ordinary stillness and sedate proprieties of our people. It appears, friend, from the narrative, that Quakerism is no hindrance to any one's being not only an honest and good man, but a courageous and brave one, as friend Ellwood gave proof enough of a bold, brave spirit; and with his clear conscience, stout principle, and resolute purpose, he could dare much for truth and right; and though possessed of gentle goodness to win affection

of others, he could endure and suffer with the patience and fortitude of a Christian martyr.

I need not repeat to thee, friend Editor, how little I admire and approve History, compared with other readers; but that all honest, conscientious Dissenters of our day may be duly thankful to God for the peaceful, free, and happy possession and enjoyment of their Christian faith, I could wish the history of second Charles Stuart's reign not quite forgotten. Even in those "evil times" there were courageous good men, to assert the rights of conscience, and the truth and reality of virtue; or we might almost have doubted a God and Providence to have then existed, as we believe now they do. We are all assured, friend, there ever has been God and Providence (though *man's book of history* is not always, I think, the best teacher thereof), and that the servant of truth and righteousness, the man of faith and integrity, has ever been watched over and approved by them.

With much esteem and good wishes, I remain, respected friend, thine faithfully,

DAVID DRAB.

LONDON, 12th day of 9th month, 1846.

[From the Christian Reformer, (London,) October, 1846.]

GERMANY.

GERMAN AND ENGLISH EFFORTS AFTER CHRISTIAN UNION.

ONCE in the long course of nearly two thousand years, an ecclesiastical assembly, convened by royal authority, has rendered a service to religious liberty. For this gratifying sign of the times we must

not look to England, where religious liberty halts pitiably behind civil liberty, but to the country of Luther, who produced the Reformation, and of Ronge, who is now completing it. We refer to the great Synod recently held in Berlin, which, commencing its sittings on the 2nd of June, 1846, was composed of seventy-two members, nine for each of the provinces of Brandenburg, Pomerania, Posen, Prussia, the Rhine, Saxony, Silesia, and Westphalia. Each province of the Prussian monarchy was represented in the Convocation by four clergymen, and Brandenburg by five; each, except Posen and Westphalia, had there also a professor in theology and another in law; and each had, besides, three lay deputies. There were present, when the Synod opened, thirty-three ministers of religion, six professors of theology and six of law, and twenty-four laymen, making in all sixty-nine. The clergy consisted of superintendents of districts, secretaries of provincial synods, presidents of consistories, or court-preachers. The laity were mayors, burgesses, noblemen, or professors, having among them three professors and the Lieutenant-General, von Hiller. To four, the name of Bishop is prefixed, namely, Neander, Ritschl, Freymark, Ross. The Synod comprised a most competent representation of the highest German culture in religious concerns. The President's chair was as of right taken by Eichhorn, Prussian State Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs. The election of Vice-president lay with the Synod. It gave occasion to a severe contest. Bishop Neander gained the honor over a layman, namely, Bethmann Holveg, of Bonn.

The business was divided among eight Committees, who reported to the General Assembly, with whom lay the right of adoption and rejection. Many of the questions, relating to local and disci-

plinary matters, may be passed, as being of little interest to our readers. The great question was one intimately touching the interests of religious liberty, and arising out of the progress of mind made in religion especially during the last century. This question involved the validity of creeds, the right of imposing, the duty of accepting them. These points were decided in the negative by a large majority. The exact shape in which the question was brought under discussion regarded the ordination of candidates for the ministry. Was the door of the church to be opened or closed; and if closed, what was to be the key? The decision, we are happy to say, was in favor of open doors, and this a short time before "the Holy," we mean "the Evangelical, Alliance" in London decided even to carry on their discussions with closed doors, to the exclusion of the public and the press. We translate the words of a letter from Berlin, dated the 7th August, and addressed to the Augsburg Gazette:—"The Synod a few days since brought to a termination the question of creeds, and its decisions will not fail to produce a considerable and happy effect on our religious concerns: the point for decision was, whether ministers, in order to receive ordination, should be required to acknowledge the creeds and certain dogmatic writings received in the Protestant church. By a large majority the Synod has refused to establish any requirement of the kind, leaving to each minister to follow those standards or not, or to follow them to such and such a point. This decision is so much the more worthy of praise, because the majority of the Synod belong to orthodoxy (would that our English orthodoxy were of the same spirit!). All the restriction that the Synod has seen fit to appoint is found in a recommendation that preachers should not carry on an active warfare

against the creeds, seeing that on them reposes the faith of the great body of Protestants. These liberal views of the Synod, surpassing public expectation, are the object of universal eulogium."

In truth, the public mind was much excited. Fears for the safety of religious liberty prevailed, which found expression in petitions addressed to the Synod, among which one from Breslau is of special merit. These fears had been in a measure calmed by two excellent addresses delivered by the President Eichhorn, who, speaking in a truly liberal tone, declared the intentions of the Government, namely, to preserve the old with a firm but gentle hand, and to prepare and lead the way to such modifications of the old as would meet and satisfy the requirements of systematic knowledge and the wants of the age. Thus, in Germany, speaks a Minister of State before a great religious assembly convened to compose and adjust religious differences — renouncing the very essence of orthodoxy, namely, the invariableness of dogmatic forms — at the very time that an Alliance free from Church-and-State trammels is making the absurd attempt, in the metropolis of the British Empire, to re-invigorate obsolescent metaphysical notions, and to form a union throughout the world on the basis of nine (still, nine are less than thirty-nine) articles of faith, requiring, among other things, that men, as the only saving faith, shall believe that by nature they are utterly depraved, and that the majority of the human race, God's children though they are, will in hell suffer endless torments! Surely, among men of this stamp, Professor Tholuck, orthodox though he is considered in Germany, must have found himself sadly out of place. Glad, however, are we that he has been among them, for he will see with his own eyes who, and of what spirit, are the men in this land that are

employing English influence and English gold in order to bring Continental churches under restraints and into fetters like their own; and on the other hand, it is not, we would fain hope, impossible that the liberal and enlightened German may awaken better thoughts, and encourage better aims, among these little Protestant popes. In these words, which, among others, Professor Tholuck spoke in Exeter Hall, a tone of thought is found, the due carrying out of which would produce a great improvement in our popular religion :—" The substantial unity of the Church is a thing which already exists, and the Evangelical Alliance has only to proclaim it to the world. All who are here must deplore the differences which exist in Christendom. But how can you put an end to them? You must make the attempt only in the way of exhortation, by the encouragement of mutual instruction. In the words of one of the Reformers of the Protestant Church — of a man who reformed not only its doctrines, but its life — I will say that there is no church, no Christian party, which can claim to possess pure truth — truth absolute in all points of view; and if these words are true, I will take the liberty of adding, that there is no church nor Christian party on the earth which may not learn something from other churches and other parties. It was thus that they might realize a grand and true union, of which we now see only the commencement." Tholuck followed up these (and other) remarks by presenting to the unionists of Exeter Hall a copy of the Form of Consecration adopted by the Synod of Berlin, which, treating the old creed-books as respectable witnesses and historical memorials of past states of mind, requires in ministers only a general adherence to Christianity, and the acknowledgment of the authority of the Sacred Scriptures. The following is a translation of this important document :

"Whosoever is lawfully called to teach in the Evangelical Church, must be consecrated by prayer and by the laying on of hands, and must publicly make profession that he is a believer in the faith common to all the Protestant Church. Wherefore, he must first declare that he will take, as the rule of his faith, not his own private opinions, nor any other human dogmas, but only the Word of God, as it is contained in the writings of prophets and apostles.

"Secondly, he must promise that, by God's help, he will faithfully, diligently, and firmly persist in that exposition of the Holy Scriptures which, according to the gift of tongues, is from the Holy Ghost, in harmony with the confession of the universal Christian Church, and with the ancient confessions of Protestantism; considering them as testimonies to the fundamental facts and fundamental truths of salvation, and as types of sound doctrine."

Then the officiating ministers shall add,

"We ask of you emphatically, if, in common with the whole Protestant Church, you confess Jesus Christ, the first-born Son, who for our sakes did make himself humble, and did take the form of a servant, to be the only mediator between God and man; recognizing the fact, that, as a Prophet sent of God, powerful in words and works, he has proclaimed peace, and that, as an eternal High-priest, he has by his death reconciled us to God; that having delivered himself up for our sins, and risen for our justification, he is seated on the right hand of God; that he has eternal power as Chief of his Church, which he assembles together, and preserves by means of his word and his sacraments, and by the Holy Spirit, which, sent by him into our hearts, teaches us to call him Lord, and to know the grace which we receive by him.

"We ask of you if, by faith in these good tidings, and in the free grace of God through his well-beloved Son, you confess that we are all sinners, but that by faith in Christ we become children of God; in consequence whereof, we are justified before God by his grace alone, without any merit in our works; and that thus we receive the promise of the incorruptible heritage which is laid up in heaven, and that by means of the same faith, laboring in love, we plentifully reap the fruits of the spirit; and, continually changing our hearts, prepare ourselves for the day of Jesus Christ."

[From the London Inquirer.]

LINES

SUGGESTED BY THE DISCOVERY OF LE VERRIER'S PLANET.

Lo, where the secret depths of heaven unfold
  The star man's *mental* vision sooner saw,
To vindicate the prescience that foretold,
  And reconcile anomaly with law.

Thus ne'er, within the shadows of our sphere,
  O, faith, the soul's astronomer, despond,
But, e'en from doubts and perturbations here,
  Wisely anticipate the *world beyond!*

Belfast. Z.

[From the London Inquirer, No. 219.]

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

To the Editor of the Inquirer.

SIR, — I have read, and not without interest, the report in the INQUIRER, No. 216, of proceedings at a late meeting of the Anti-Slavery League, together with your remarks on the subject. There is, indeed, nothing very novel in either; and I do not intend to trouble you with criticising them. I have already done my endeavor to lead some of the parties to a calm consideration of the means which ought to be pursued before any reasonable expectation of putting an end to slavery can be entertained, and I certainly have no hope of making any useful impression on them. I trust, however, that the more sober-minded members of the new association will restrain that disposition to arrogance and disregard to the opinions of others, which there is ground for believing has greatly injured the cause of emancipation in America, by placing in violent hostility those who, being members of abolition societies, rank themselves as friends of the Negroes, — and the slave-owners, who, though the second party, possess the fearful power of determining the question at issue.

I am now induced to resume the pen by a somewhat unaccountable inconsistency into which Mr. George Thompson, the worthy chairman of the meeting, appears to me to have been betrayed, by giving his sanction to the proceedings. He referred to "another League which had nobly done its work." With that League, if I mistake not, Mr. Thompson was formerly connected, and I confess I wonder that he did not notice a very striking difference in the tone prevailing among those whom he now leads, from that which was adopted by his earlier associates. The two Leagues had in their objects some features of resemblance. Each was levelled against an evil, which, however differing in nature and degree, occasioned each, in its way, great injury to the welfare and moral character of the people affected by them. Both evils were upheld by the strong, for their supposed benefit, against the weak, to their manifest wrong; and to establish upright principles on their overthrow, required, in each case, the combined efforts of numbers, guided by talent, energy, perseverance, and, above all, discretion. In the first case, these qualities were abundantly supplied, as is proved by the number and variety of statistical facts sought out and disseminated, the body of able lecturers dispersed throughout the country, and the instructions they received to conduct their proceedings with great moderation of language. Of these instructions I have not now a copy at hand; but I have before me the "Address to the Ministers of all Religious Denominations throughout the United Kingdom," inviting them to the national conference at Manchester, dated July 13, 1841, and signed

Geo. Thompson, hon sec., in which they are desired to "receive the present Address as if from friends of the suffering poor, and lovers of peace and righteousness." The Address is throughout in this spirit, which was the main guide in action. I do not mean that the iniquity of the Corn-Laws was not animadverted on, that their injustice and cruelty were never exposed; but remembering the condition of the people in many districts during a considerable part of this struggle, that men and their families were almost starving, and might have been easily excited, the reasonable inference is, that the moderation enjoined by the committee was fully observed by their missionaries; and as, in the progress of their exertions, the League drew many friends from the hostile ranks, when the triumph was achieved, their organ of the 4th of July last, in a farewell address, thus expressed itself:—"That on some occasions more violent language was used than the occasion required, or than strict decorum might sanction, may safely be confessed; the immensity of the means was inseparable from the excess. An agitation spread over the whole extent of Britain must have occasionally fretted and foamed, like the tide when it passes over a shoal, or is impeded by a rock; but these aberrations were lost in the general advantage; the dashing of the spray was but an incident in the onward flow of the mighty waters."

Such was the career of wisdom and prudence pursued by men as earnestly engaged in their cause as ever men were; and, remember, the Corn-Laws were but of thirty years' standing, during which modifications of various kinds had shown symptoms of instability. On the other hand, American slavery has reached a vigorous growth, and its influence extends to all parts of the Union. It is true, it is most rank in particular States; but slavery in the district of Columbia is sanctioned by the Federal Government, and it is recognised in the "Free States," even by the constitution which enjoins the surrender of fugitive slaves to their bondage, and the suppression, by force, of any insurrection which may take place. Thus the contagion runs throughout society, and the qualities so admirably combined for the repeal of the Corn-Laws are here required in ten-fold strength.

But the Abolitionists are too wise to be guided by experience; they seem to imagine that all power is centred, not in the slave-owners, but in themselves, or that the cause of emancipation is of less value than the pleasure they derive from indulging in harsh and indiscriminating invective against any persons who presume to question the correctness of their judgment. They condemn slave-holding, as if it were the crime of individuals more than the crime of the State. They do not consider, that, as long as crime has the sanction of authority, criminals will be found to commit the crime, and, therefore, that we should first endeavor to obtain a change in the law—to make the crime penal;—then would authority be allied to justice and humanity,—the crime which now it does not see, and the criminal whom it does not know, would be equally subject to its frown. In such a pursuit, the example of that "other League which has so nobly done its

work" might, one thinks, be a lesson to Abolitionists. It might direct the energy now wasted in excitement which can serve no useful end, to the means of bringing a due influence to bear on the legislative power. But of whom is the legislative power composed? For the most part, of slave-holders. Then what are the constituencies? Again, for the most part, slave-holders. But let Dr. Channing describes their career He says (vol. i, p 265): — "The adoption of the common system of agitation by Abolitionists has not been justified by success. It made converts of a few individuals, but alienated multitudes. Its influence at the South has been almost wholly evil. It has stirred up bitter passions and fierce fanaticism, which have shut up every heart against its arguments and persuasions. These effects are more to be deplored, because the hope of freedom to the slave lies chiefly in the dispositions of his master. The Abolitionist proposed, indeed, to convert the slave-holders; and for this end he approached them with vituperation, and exhausted on them the vocabulary of reproach. And he has reaped as he sowed. His vehement pleadings for the slaves have been answered by wilder tones from the slave-holder; and, what is worse, deliberate defences of slavery have been sent forth in the spirit of the dark ages, and in defiance of the moral convictions and feelings of the Christian and the civilized world. Thus, with good purposes, nothing seems to have been gained. Perhaps (though I am anxious to repel the thought) something has been lost to the cause of freedom and humanity." And, at p. 283, he further says: —"I think, too, that they are chargeable with a like intolerance towards those in the Free States who oppose them, or who refuse to participate in their operations. They have been apt to set down opposition to themselves as equivalent to attachment to slavery. Regarding their own dogmas as the only true faith, and making their own zeal the standard of a true interest in the oppressed, they have cast scornful looks and reproaches on those who have spoken in doubt or displeasure of their movements. This has made them many foes. They have been too belligerent to make friends. I do not mean in these remarks that the Abolitionists have had nothing to blame in their opponents. Among these are not a few deserving of severe reprehension, and I have no desire to shield them from it. But the great mass who have refused to take part in the anti-slavery movement have been governed by pure motives. If they have erred, they have not erred willingly, or from the influence of low and servile passions. They have, consequently, been wronged by the treatment they have received at the hands of Abolitionists; and men are not brought over by wrongs to a good cause."

Thus, as the Anti-Corn-Law League acquired strength in their progress, the Abolitionists only excite disgust, and gain weakness. In assuming a lead in such a cause, therefore, one might hope that the object of Mr. Thompson was to infuse wisdom and well-directed energy into the councils of an association, acting in a name of which he may feel some jealousy; but he does not ap-

pear to have intimated the idea, and the tone of all around forbids our entertaining it. Should this, however, prevent its being pursued?

If slave-holders were left to the action of those evils which are inseparable from the system, they could not hear of the changes in distant places, without reflecting whether, by introducing them at home, they would not derive at least equal advantage. Labor procured from men in the abject condition of yoked oxen, can have no aid from their understanding, good-will, or sympathy, — it must be "overlooked," — that is, in too many cases, it must be stimulated by the lash; in the absence of which it is, of course, misapplied or wasted. Besides, slaves are necessarily irritating; their laziness, thievishness, sulkiness, lying, the natural fruits of their condition, are sore trials to those who are placed over them. Such causes prevent the purposes of their labor from being fulfilled; they are very possibly counteracted. Lands are not well prepared; the produce is neither cultivated with care nor saved with economy. In short, the men have no competent knowledge; the masters are inconveniently called upon to supply their deficiences; their estates fall short in their produce, and are less profitable than it might reasonably be expected they would be. Now, American planters are not wanting in observation; results cannot escape them; they must feel the daily annoyance and perplexity which pursue them, and which exhibit so formidable an item in their periodical settlements. Then they must hear of the advantage with which the lands in West Virginia and East Tennessee are chiefly cultivated with the muscles of freemen. But the accounts of the perfect success which has crowned West India emancipation, are still better calculated to awaken their attention. Already, the peaceful missionary of his own Christian benevolence, Joseph John Gurney, unconnected with all societies, has reached them with his "Familiar letters to Henry Clay, of Kentucky, describing a winter in the West Indies." The great event which he commemorates, commencing in 1834, was completed in 1838. In 1840, he laid his simple and unoffending story before the slave-holders of America, and it cannot be read by them without respect, — if it were not presumptuous, one would hazard an opinion that even Abolitionists might read it with benefit. He told them of the vast improvement which was already perceptible in the character and conduct of the freed laborers; the great diminution of crime, as shown by the state of the gaols; their attention to domestic comfort, demeanor, and dress: some had built for themselves good cottages, others temporary huts, and others were preparing ground for building. The rates of wages had been satisfactorily arranged, and they who received them made ample return in their willing industry; while estates, being more fruitful, had risen, and were still rising, in value. This evidence is confirmed by more recent accounts — the most recent I have seen being the letters of Mr. William Smith, of Jamaica, which appeared in the *Economist* a

few weeks ago. But there is also a passage in a speech delivered by Earl Grey, in the House of Lords, on the 10th of August, which is entitled to special attention. I quote from the abridged report of the *Spectator*:—"Lord Elgin's reports show, that, in Jamaica, the planter is convinced that his interest, as well as that of his workmen, is directly concerned in raising the character and the intelligence of the working-man; and that means are taken to develop that intelligence by education. They could not, by the agency of slaves, adopt improved methods; and so sensible were the assembly of Jamaica of this truth, that they have cordially responded to all the calls made upon them for the means of giving an extended and improved education, and have adopted measures so energetic and so well devised, that they must, in a few years, produce great effects. These are the means which freedom has of competing with slavery."

Now, who can imagine that the American planters will not be eager to compare such intelligence with their own experience; or that the desire to amend their own plans and to promote the well-doing of their undertakings will not stimulate them to further inquiry into the accuracy of the statements which they receive? It would be no very wonderful thing, if, with a less philanthropic purpose, some young planter should emulate the enterprise of Mr. Gurney, and make a voyage to the West Indies, that he may see with his own eyes, and, with the aid of his knowledge, investigate more thoroughly than he can by means of publications. Rely upon it, that while, even in Russia, serfdom is becoming extinct, the republican citizens of the American Union will not feel that they hold the rank which belongs to them, so long as they continue to be the breeders of slaves. Nor will they relish the idea that, though, in other countries, the arts of industry and skill are rapidly advancing, to the great benefit of science and civilization among them, they must linger behind, because their artizans are few, and slaves have neither the knowledge nor the inducement to qualify themselves for the work.

One consideration remains, which slave-holders will not easily forego; for they are accustomed to regard slavery as a question, not of morals but of property; and I shall not stay to discuss the matter. If I have shown a way by which all other difficulties may be avoided, this ought not to delay for an instant the blessed advent of emancipation. To be sure, Henry Clay has imagined an estimate of the pecuniary value of the slaves in America, which looks as if he intended to present an obstacle not to be surmounted. But if eight hundred thousand slaves in our West Indies were fully and satisfactorily paid for with twenty millions sterling, as I believe they were, to talk of twelve hundred millions of dollars for the slaves of America is at least what he may consider an error on the right side. But the number of slaves may be ascertained with perfect accuracy, and it is rather too soon to enter upon details. Meantime, the good sense of Mr. Rufus King has suggested a mode of compensation which would

afford the most ample means,—out of the unappropriated lands of the several states an adequate value may be applied, without interfering in any serious degree with other national objects. But if this be regarded as a sacrifice, what rational, what humane being can demur? To rescue a country of such extent and capabilities from the curse of slavery will be an imperishable glory to the age in which it is accomplished. No pitiful calculation, no pharisaic arrogance, can be entitled to a thought; the community which would contribute the land would gain emancipation, and thus facilitate the future progress of every social improvement.

Methinks an efficient member of that League, which worked out for us the means of providing for our physical wants, and of promoting a friendly inter-communication with other nations, would still rather seek, by a calm appeal to reason and experience, to induce those who retain the bonds of slavery, to relinquish a system so much at variance with that universal benevolence which regulates the order of nature, than sanction an attempt, by rash excitement, to raise the unfortunate slaves from their miserable condition, to the rank they were designed to hold amongst us; and he must say with Dr. Channing,—"In the present case, the words of truth and good-will are the only weapons for a Christian to fight with."

Sept. 5, 1846. AMICUS.

MORE LIGHT.

The last words of Goethe were, "Dass mehr Licht hereinkomme"—a prayer for "more Light!"

THY ways are wonderful, O Lord, and Thou
Not by our feeble hands dost work Thy will:
Thy showers ripen, and Thy lightnings kill,
And we before Thy dispensations bow
In trusting hope, though ignorant. Even now
The russet corn is thick on many a hill;
The heavens are blue, and earth is lovely still,
As when Thy seal was stamped upon her brow:
And yet the righteous perish. Hate is strong,
And Self is as a God among mankind;
Half Thy fair world is plunged in deepest night;
With earnest voice we cry, "O Lord, how long
Shall these things be? Our faith, though strong, is blind;
One only boon we ask, O God—more Light!"

C.

(From the Inquirer, No. 225—London, October, 1846.)

LADY HEWLEY'S CHARITY AGAIN.

THOUGH the mere mention of Lady HEWLEY'S Charity in Dissenting circles is sufficient to create an involuntary shudder at the renewal of so painful and threadbare a topic, yet we cannot give insertion to a paragraph relating to it, which will be found elsewhere, without an explanatory comment, for the information of those who, through ignorance or sectarian zeal, have hitherto made common cause with the original institutors of this religious litigation.

After many years' toil and trouble on the part of those zealots, the only point yet accomplished by them has been the exclusion of Unitarians and Churchmen from its management and participation in its funds. Be it remembered, that it was but a bare fraction of the crumbs which ever fell to their lot; and there was not the shadow of impeachment of the integrity of the ejected Trustees, whose theological opinions were their sole disqualification. If, as was stated by the present Lord Chancellor, in debate on the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, "it was not *comparatively* difficult to find who was *not* entitled," it becomes extremely so, "when you endeavor to ascertain who *is* entitled out of all the different classes of Dissenters. A great variety will rush in and make a claim, and the Court of Chancery will hereafter have to decide between these various claimants, which of them approximates the nearest to the opinions *supposed to have been* entertained by Lady Hewley at the time she made her deed. The property is now under the care of the Court of Chancery, and I (continued his lordship) have no doubt that the Court will have the care of it for an indefinite number of years, because a new suit has

now been instituted, and as numerous as are the classes of Dissenters, so many different claimants may there be to this unfortunate fund; and great as it is, it is not a very hazardous prophecy to announce, that no congregation whatever will hereafter derive any benefit from it."— *Debates*, p. 379.

We presume that Mr. Visard's present occupation in Liverpool is to take evidence on behalf of these claimants, showing, or rather attempting to show, the precise theological opinions of the Foundress, and their agreement with their own. We cannot envy the lawyers and judges, whose duty it will be to wade through so dark and intricate a labyrinth, which we predict will rival all the polemic disquisitions on scholastic divinity extant, since the days of St. Thomas Aquinas.

The original promoters of this suit had no expectation of being dragged into this controversy; they perhaps fondly hoped, that after ousting the Unitarians, they would have been permitted to enter and take quiet possession of their conquest, and to shut the door against all intruders; but they must now be fully convinced of their mistake. Acting, or pretending to act for a public object, all they could obtain by their suit was, that the Court of Chancery should take upon itself the appointment of Trustees, and the regulation of the Charity for the future.

The consequence has been, that the field has been opened to the contention, for the favor of the Court in making such appointment, between all and every sect who can subscribe literally, or sophistically, the leading dogmas of Trinitarian theology. It is well known that the numerous Orthodox ministers in the north of England who formed the great bulk of the recipients of this Charity under its (alleged) wrongful administration, by no means relished the suspension of the exhibition formerly made to them by the immersion of the Trust-property in the Charyt

dis of the law. They were the first victims to the rapacity of "Orthodox solicitors associated with the enthusiasm of acquisitive divines."*

"LADY HEWLEY'S CASE."

[From the Manchester Examiner.]

MANY of our readers are aware, that upwards of a century ago, "Dame Sarah Hewley" bequeathed a considerable amount of property for the relief and aid of "poor and godly ministers." Being an English Presbyterian, her "trust" was administered by persons holding the religious principles which she professed. But it is well known that the English Presbyterians, as a body, gradually renounced their "orthodoxy"; and hence, in course of time, her ladyship's charity came to be managed by trustees, who belonged to the Unitarian denomination. To the credit of such trustees it must be admitted that they displayed far less sectarianism than might have been expected, and that they were liberal in the distribution of the funds at their disposal to evangelical and dissenting ministers in general who were in poor and necessitous circumstances. But about twenty years ago, Mr. George Hadfield, of this town, Mr. John Wilson, of London, and others, all *Independents*, commenced an action in Chancery against the Unitarian trustees, upon the ground that they were not entitled to administer an evangelical trust. After a long and most expensive contest carried on in one court after another, judgment was finally given in favor of the Independent "reason," and the Unitarians were ejected. But the Evangelical Presbyterians were always of opinion that if the Unitarians had no legal right to administer the trust because they did not hold Lady Hewley's doctrinal sentiments, the Independents had as little, because they did not accord with her views relative to church government. Wherefore, two different parties of Presbyterians in the country, those belonging to the United Secession Church, and those nominally connected with the Established Church of Scotland, but having very many English Evangelical Presbyterians amongst their members, and

* Mr. Shiel.

not a few purely English Evangelical congregations pertaining to them, applied to the successful litigants to be permitted to participate in the management of the trust. But the legal advisers entrusted by the Independent "relators," would listen to no appeal — would enter into no arrangement.

One would have thought that, if zeal for purity of doctrine had alone been the cause of their struggle with the Unitarians, they would have been anxious to spare further expenditure, and to avoid, if possible, all disagreement with denominations which recognized "the same gospel," and differed merely as to the minor point of Church government, and to one of which they had always professed the greatest friendship. Being determined, however, to have the disposal of the property exclusively in their own power, they constrained the Presbyterian parties, to whom we have referred, to apply (from a sense of justice to the principal of the trust itself, as well as to the interests of their respective denominations) to the "Master in Chancery," praying, not that the Independents should be excluded, but that they also should be represented in the trust. Hence another protracted and expensive contest was begun. Their reasons were considered to be valid, and judgment was given that each of these Presbyterian parties should be allowed to nominate two trustees, leaving the Independents with three. But against this decision appeal was made. It was, nevertheless, confirmed, both by the Vice-Chancellor and the Lord Chancellor, after years of vexatious and expensive opposition. But even yet the relators must needs resist; and now, finding that they could not exclude the Presbyterians, they next resolved to procure, if possible, an allocation of the funds of the charity, according to the numerical proportion of the different parties, and to show that very few Presbyterian ministers in England are entitled to participate in the benefit of the fund, it being alleged that the Presbyterian Congregations generally are Scotch. Thus, if Presbyterian trustees must be admitted, it is attempted to prevent them from having almost any denominational interest to represent, and to secure almost all the money to purposes which the sectarianism of the "relators" may lead them to promote. In pursuance, therefore, of this course.

citations were served on a number of ministers and gentlemen in this town and neighborhood, commanding them to appear on Thursday last at Liverpool, before Samuel Johnson Roberts, Esq., acting commissioner for the high court of chancery, to bring with them chapel deeds and minutes of Presbytery, to be examined as cause may require.

We fear that an increase of expenditure and of party feeling will be the only result of the new scheme which has been adopted. We are far from implicating the Independent denomination at large in the recent measures of these relators. Indeed, we are well assured that the liberal and leading members of the body, both lay and clerical, not only in this town, but throughout the country, repudiate the continued hostility to their Presbyterian brethren which is thus displayed. Many old, indigent, and pious ministers of the Congregational denomination itself have for nearly ten years been deprived of all benefit from the charity in consequence of the coarse contentious spirit of their professed friends. An enormous amount of money has been worse than wasted. The unseemly spectacle has been exhibited, of one sect of Christians most pertinaciously resisting the repeatedly delivered judgments of the Court of Chancery, in favor of the claims of another holding precisely the same religious principles, and seeking, not to oust the Independents, but merely to participate in the management of an important trust, so that it may be prevented from becoming entirely sectarian, and rendered useful "to fair and godly" ministers, not only of their own but also of other denominations. The charity is not an endowment properly so called, otherwise a considerable number, both of the Presbyterians and Independents, would never have claimed a share of its funds. We believe that many of them would gladly see it applied to purposes of general education in the five northern counties of England, and we trust that some arrangement may yet be made, by which the four thousand a-year which it affords may be turned to that purpose, instead of being wasted in mischievous litigation.

THE

UNITARIAN.

[From the Inquirer, No. 229.]

THE PEACE SOCIETY.

The first of a series of lectures, in connection with this society, was delivered on Tuesday evening, at the Hall of Commerce, Threadneedle-street, by John Bowring, Esq., LL.D., M. P. — subject, "The Political and Commercial importance of Peace." The audience was numerous and respectable.

Dr. Bowring, on rising, was greeted with considerable applause. He said that a most unexpected and undeserved honor had been done him, in requesting him to address them that evening; but he was sure they would find an excuse for the incomplete and imperfect observations he should address to them, in the great willingness with which he had responded to the call of the committee of the Peace Society — (hear). Peace might be considered as the normal and natural state of human society. It was the state which was associated with the very earliest history of the human race, — the state to which they believed that, under the guidance of sound philanthropy and pure Christianity, mankind

was gradually again tending. That it was a desirable, happy, and blessed state, few would be found to deny. It was a healthy state — that in which society put forth all its physical, moral, and intellectual powers, and employed them for the noblest purposes. It was the state in which those kind and social affections, which were the source and cement of individual and domestic felicity, extended themselves, from friend to friend, from friend to fellow-citizen, from the citizens to the people, from the people to the whole race of man. Its influence broke down the demarcations of caste and color, of poverty and opulence, of ignorance and knowledge, of barbarism and refinement, of controversy and creed, of land and language. It looked with a brotherly eye; it stretched out the friendly hand over land and ocean, to the poles, to the tropics, and all that lay between. Its mission was all-invading, all-embracing; it was the health of the world. And war was the disease of the world, blighting, corroding, destroying; and, as a disease — a contagious, pestiferous disease — it should be dealt with by moralists and philanthropists. Let them look to its origin and progress, and endeavor to discover how it operated. The same motives which impelled individual men in their career of folly and crime, appeared to move nations when launched upon the broad field of war, folly and crime exercised their widest influence. He who robbed another, saw, in the deed, a rapid and ready mode of self-aggrandizement; so, a people, trained to military habits, became restless under pacific inactivity, and, by the invasion and plunder of other lands, fancied they could most swiftly and successfully secure and strengthen their national domain. But it might well be doubted if ever a nation was really benefited by war — (hear). It might be shown that the victories of war had

never added to the substantial greatness of a people, whatever they might of temporary glory; their brightness was but transitory. Fighting communities had their days and years of success; but they were swept away by the tempests they had themselves raised, and undermined by the corrupting and demoralizing elements they had gathered together. Upon the wreck and ruin of war an enduring empire was never founded; and if, sometimes, nations seemed to struggle into greatness by warlike conquests, it was because peace came to heal the breaches that war had made, and to restore that prosperity which war never failed to impair. The warlike legions which went forth to conquer other lands, however dazzling their achievements, exercised far less enduring influence, and maintained their territories by far less secure hold, than did the peaceful missionaries of commerce, who quitted their native lands to colonize others. The national genius of the Gaelic, and more especially of the Anglo-Saxon, family, was pacific; the Norman invasion had introduced into these lands an infusion of that warlike spirit which marked the Franks. If Great Britain had created, as undoubtedly she had, an empire far wider than that of Greek or Roman fame, it had been less by the power of her armies, than by the weight of her intellect. Our progress had often been stained with blood; but comparatively less so than that of the other European nations that had invaded America, Asia, Africa, and the Australian territories. It were indeed easy, in the records of our colonial history, to fix upon foul deeds, that had branded with infamy many distinguished actors — (hear) — but if our system of colonization had been, on the whole, more prosperous than that of our neighbors, it was because it had been, on the whole, more peaceful and benevo-

lent — (hear). Constituted as English society was, all impulses descended from the privileged to the unprivileged classes, from the ruling few to the serving many; and the education of what were *called* the higher orders gave a most erroneous tone to the moral and religious sentiments of what were called the lower orders — (cheers). That education was denominated classical — (hear) — and it served to feed and inflame warlike passions. Among the ancients, courage was synonymous with every virtue, and valor with excellence; in truth, in most of the pagan writers this courage stood on the highest summit of human excellence. Now courage, in most of its manifestations, was rather a physical than a mental quality, and was exhibited by some brute animals in as self-sacrificing a form as by any of the human race. Considered as a mental quality, courage might, or might not, be a virtue. Crime had its courage, (though it might be called desperation,) as well as humanity or benevolence, when it obtained the name of heroism; but courage, exercised in a military career, whether on the side of right or wrong, was placed in the catalogue of virtues alike by Christian as by heathen writers—(hear, hear). It might have been hoped that the ecclesiastics would have brought some antidote to the bane which classical studies had infused into the minds of our youth; but, alas! the Bible and the bayonet the sword and the Scriptures, had been brought into most unholy union — (cheers). Our Church authorities were forward to bless the warlike banner, to rouse the martial spirit, to offer up thanksgivings for victory, and to call on the God of Peace, the common Father, to take part in the bloody strifes that were waging among his infatuated children — (loud cheers). What wonder, if such were the example of the lofty and learned, if the opinion of

the lowly and half-informed multitude should be perverted. But was there not some ground for hoping and believing that a more pure and perfect spirit, born among the multitude, might force its way upward — (hear)? Was there not promise in the temperance movement — (hear)? Was not the growing unwillingness to enlist into the army, evidence of the improved state of popular opinion — (hear)? Were not the discussions on capital punishment assisting their cause — (cheers)? In truth, the pacific question was intimately connected with whatever represented the progress and civilization of mankind — (cheers). A respect for life, a true appreciation of its value, a tenderness for its security and preservation, were among the most striking evidences of the advance from a savage to a civilized condition. Among barbarous tribes, blood was spilt in utter recklessness, and the destruction of a fellow-creature was neither contemplated with abhorrence, or marked with remorse; but, with the progress of individual and social improvement, the worth of life began to be recognized, and the earliest and rudest efforts of legislation were exhibited in the desire for its protection; and society advanced by the recognition of the sacredness of human life, and the necessity for surrounding it with all the security which the strength and wisdom of the community could afford. Then its extinction became the subject of most solemn deliberation; murder, or the destruction of life, was denounced as the most heinous of crimes, and visited with the heaviest penalties. But as more and more of the spirit of benevolence and philanthropy was brought to bear upon the topic, doubt arose whether, under any circumstances, even as punishment for the crime of murder itself, the law should become a murderer — (cheers). All would concur, that experience had

justified what had been done for making our penal code less barbarous and blood-shedding. All must allow that the growing reverence for human life, and the unwillingness to consent to its execution, were among the leading characteristics of the present day. But what said war, and the warlike passion? Did they weigh or duly estimate the value of life? Alas! life was the trifle with which they sported, the offering which they sacrificed, the commodity which they bartered. Their own lives, or the lives of their fellow-men, were what warriors were quite willing to take or to give, to wrest from others, or to yield themselves; and, when the battle tale was told, the amount of life perilled or destroyed were the ingredients of glory; and, in proportion to the multitude who fell would be the rejoicing, the revelling, and the reward — (hear). Fascinated by the delusive attractions of victory, all serious thought seemed laid aside; banners waved, and anthems were sung; national thanks and honors were awarded to the actors on the bloody stage of war. And who ventured to enquire what was this war, whose triumphs were celebrated with such loud outbursts of enthusiasm? All the crimes which men shrunk from, — all that the bad perpetrated, — all that was read, heard, or dreamt of man's distress and misery, — all that the devil would do, if gone stark mad, — all that defied the worst that pen or pencil could describe, — this was war. What a contrast even to the Mussulman's notion of a happy and virtuous state, which Mahomet himself, under the momentary influence of a Christian spirit, described in the Koran as the abode where no sound of war was heard, no thought of sin, but one sole word, peace, peace. War, no doubt, represented some of the triumphs of the human intellect. An army was a stupendous engine, a wonderful gath-

ering of men, whom discipline had turned into machines — (laughter). Happy would it be if the physical momentum could be maintained, and thought and feeling transferred to a nobler and worthier field. An army was a most imposing example of the power of congregated and marshalled men. For thousands of years the genius of nations had been inquiring how armies could be made most efficient for the dreadful doings for which they were intended. Countless millions had been drawn from the labor and wealth of the community, in order that the military glory of the people might be preserved untarnished. But it had never occurred to statesmen to institute this inquiry, — If war or the fear of war, had given birth to such vast combinations as this, what might be done by a combination in the spirit of peace — (cheers)? Were all those strong motives which were brought to act upon the less noble parts of our nature, for the encouragement of the military passion, applied to the development of man's improvement, how soon would the face of society be changed. But public opinion must be enlightened, and informed, and educated to these aspirations. The politician in the forum, the legislator in the senate-house, the minister who directed the whole machinery of destruction, forbade thought. If serious thought interposed, would not the hand be arrested which was raised to kill, — would not the energy be chilled, when engaged in planning or perfecting some gigantic work of desolation, — would not the conscience be staggered at the contemplation of all the wickedness and woe of war? Yes, it was want of thought which was the foundation of these mighty mischiefs. Thought — charitable, Christian thought — would repair it all — (cheers). Dr. Bowring then dwelt at some length, and with great eloquence, on the fruits of peace,

cheap and good literature, improved education, railways, and steam-navigation. He produced a number of figures, to prove that the exports and imports of this country had greatly increased during the thirty years' peace, and that the prosperity of the trade and manufactures of the country had been augmented. He dwelt especially, amidst loud applause, on the beneficial results of free trade. This, the noblest of revolutions (the establishment of universal peace) was to be accomplished by commerce, by liberalized, emancipated commerce. Every vessel that quitted our shores, in the pursuit of honorable traffic, was a missionary of good. Every act of barter was a link in that chain of brotherhood which ought to encircle the world. Peace had won its victories, greater than those of war—(great cheering).

Mr. Stevens moved a vote of thanks to Dr. Bowring, which, having been seconded by the Rev. Thos. Jefferson, was carried unanimously; and,

After a few words of acknowledgment from the honorable and learned gentleman, the business of the evening concluded.

[From the Christian Reformer, No. 23—London, November, 1846.]

Unitarianism exhibited in its Actual Condition: consisting of Essays by several Unitarian Ministers and others, illustrative of the Rise, Progress and Principles of Christian Anti-trinitarianism in different Parts of the World. Edited by the Rev. J. R Beard, D. D. pp. 346. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co.

The Christian world at large, and especially that section of it with which he is more particularly connected, is under great obligations to Dr. Beard for the unwearied industry and eminent ability with which he has devoted himself to the defence and illustration of the doctrines, principles and sentiments of evangelical truth. Not only by original works of high merit, but by obtaining the coöperation of able writers for the elucidation of some common topic, he has in various ways contributed largely to enrich our theological literature. The volume before us is an important one; it professes to exhibit the state of Anti-trinitarianism throughout the Christian world, and we receive the work with thankfulness and confidence, as an authentic record of facts and opinions respecting a subject of the highest moment. Dr. Beard, so far from overestimating the strength and importance of the religious body to which he belongs, has, we think, in some instances, refrained from saying much that he might, with perfect truth and with great advantage, have said in support of his arguments and in confirmation of his statements. There is no attempt at exaggeration or embellishment or parade. It is a calm, dispassionate survey that he takes of the Christian world, and the information which he gives us as the result of his inquiries is in a high degree encouraging and gratifying. Accustomed as men are to regard our religious denomination in this country as

an insignificant sect, and, partly in ignorance and partly in scorn, to ask, "Who and what are the Unitarians?"—they will be surprised, we think, to find to what an extent the great doctrines of Unitarian Christianity prevail, and by what a weight of talent, learning and moral worth its advocates are distinguished. Nor will the result of Dr. Beard's investigation be other than surprising as well as cheering to the Unitarians themselves. Indeed, however men may attempt to persuade themselves into a belief of the Trinity, our own conviction is, that an enlightened inquirer who rids himself of prejudice and party bias, who reads and thinks for himself, and who studies the Scriptures without the aid of interpretations which human creeds and articles have prescribed, very seldom indeed arrives at any other conclusions than those which are in unison with the great leading doctrines of Unitarian Christianity. Disguise or modify it as they may, to this conclusion do they all come at last; and by few, except the ignorant or unthinking, is the doctrine of the Trinity in its grosser form and features embraced. But the book before us deals with open and avowed Unitarianism, and enough is stated to encourage the hopes and invigorate the zeal of all those who are laboring for the diffusion of purer, more rational and more scriptural views of religious truth. It consists of essays and statements, partly original and partly contributed by enlightened and judicious writers, who, animated by a kindred spirit with the Editor, have indulged in no extravagant or delusive representations, but have performed their task with a calmness and sobriety of thought and feeling becoming the great subject upon which they were invited to treat. The spirit of the volume is a sound and healthy spirit, and we are thankful that we have among us men like Dr. Beard, who, led astray by

no mystical or metaphysical delusions, plant themselves on that rock of historical testimony which they know so well how to defend, and against which no assaults, however ingenious or insidious, will ever prevail.

The Editor, after the passing of the "Dissenters' Chapels Bill," thought it a seasonable time for reviewing the condition of the religious body who had occupied so great a share of the attention of the legislature and of the public at large during the memorable session of 1844. But here Dr. Beard shall speak for himself.

"The security of tenure guaranteed to the property of the non-subscribing congregations of Great Britain and Ireland, by the passing of that liberal and enlightened measure, commonly known by the name of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, appeared to the Editor a suitable occasion for collecting evidences of one of the consequences of free inquiry, and the prevalence of scriptural knowledge, in the renunciation of the Pagan and metaphysical notion of the Trinity. These evidences are here presented to the public. They show an amount of Anti-trinitarian Christianity which few, perhaps, will have expected; and are thus fitted to afford encouragement to those who, in this country especially, are exposed to no small obloquy, in consequence of their maintenance of the simple teachings of the Bible; namely, that God is one, and that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is the only true God. Nor is it, as the writer hopes, impossible that the volume may do something to extend the conviction that definite doctrines, though few in number and simple in character, lie at the basis of the religion of Jesus Christ. It is, at the same time, highly pleasing to find many proofs, in the ensuing Essays, that these few and simple truths may enter into very diverse states of mind, appear under many modifications, and put forth dissimilar effects. What is not less important is, that the consequences of the spread of Unitarianism here recorded appear, without any attempt at display, to be of the most benign description. We wish to suggest no comparison disadvantageous to other denominations; but we may say, that here are genuine Christian fruits—here are tokens of the operation of the spirit of Christ—a spirit not of fear, but of power and of love and of a sound mind."

It will be impossible very fully to analyze the

various essays contained in this useful and interesting book. We should be led beyond our limits were we to dwell at any length upon the variety of topics which the subject of each article suggests to our attention, and we feel ourselves constrained to resist the temptation which is presented, to write an article equal in extent to each of those we are now to notice. We shall, therefore, only glance *seriatim* at the contents of the volume, recommending the whole to our readers as a work full of curious matter, and urging them to possess themselves of a book without which the library of a Unitarian Christian will be incomplete.

1. The first essay is *Congregational Unitarianism in the United States of America*, and is written by the Rev. F. A. Farley. Dr. Beard assigns the first place in his work to America, doubtless as being the land in which Unitarianism flourishes in greatest vigor, and where it promises earliest to produce abundantly the richest fruits. There is much in the social institutions of America with which we have no sympathy, — much that we cannot but severely condemn; and we confess it is to the prospects which pure religion presents in that country, that we turn with the greatest interest and satisfaction. Mr. Farley has given us an extremely interesting narrative of the early rise of Unitarianism in the United States. Its history, "as a marked and distinctive form of Christian belief, begins within the first half of the 18th century;" but it was not till about thirty years since that any great demonstration was made in its favor. At that time arose Channing, "that bright, occidental star," and ever since it has advanced with accelerated progress.

"New England, and particularly Massachusetts, being the part of the country in which Unitarians are found in the greatest numbers, we are naturally to look there for the names of those

of their faith who have been distinguished in the various walks of life. Taking Massachusetts, for example, in which especially they are numerous, it is no exaggeration to say, that in early days the liberal party in theology, and in later times since the lines were more distinctly drawn, and the Unitarian body has formed a well-known and distinct portion of the religious community, they have furnished a remarkably large part of our distinguished statesmen, magistrates and public men; of those who have adorned and dignified the senate, the bench and the bar; of those who have elevated the medical profession; of devoted and learned pastors of churches; of historians, poets and chief writers of the day; of eminent public benefactors and philanthropists. And going thence, wherever Unitarians are found in any considerable numbers collected together, the like statement will hold comparatively true. Probably no single denomination, in proportion to its numbers, can boast a more brilliant constellation of great and good names than has adorned, and continues to adorn, the American Unitarian Church."

2. *Christians or Christian Connexion in the United States.*—Besides the Congregational Unitarians, "a very considerable body of religionists have arisen in the United States, who, rejecting all names, appellations and badges of distinctive party among the followers of Christ, simply call themselves *Christians.*" About half a century ago this people originated in districts remote from and unknown to each other, one branch in the South springing from the Methodists, one in the North from the Baptists, and a third in the West from the Presbyterians. They make the Bible their only system of faith, and they reject every doctrine which cannot be expressed in the words of Scripture; they do not aim at uniformity of faith, but are, generally speaking, and with very few exceptions, Unitarians.

"Although several of their preachers are defective in education, yet there are among them some good scholars and eloquent speakers, several of whom have distinguished themselves as writers. Education is fast rising in their body While their motto has ever been, 'Let him that understands the Gospel teach it,' they are also convinced that Christianity never has been, and never will be, indebted to palpable ignorance. Their

sermons are most generally delivered extempore; and energy and zeal are considered important traits in a minister for usefulness. The statistics of the connexion, though imperfect, may probably be computed at the present time (1844) as follows: number of preachers about 1500 and 500 licentiates; communicants about 325,000; churches, 1500. There are probably not less than 500,000 persons in this country who have adopted their general views and attend upon their ministry."

3. *Friends or Hicksite Quakers in the United States.* — A large portion of the Friends bear, for the sake of distinction, the name of Elias Hicks — a venerable man who a few years since resisted an attempt to bring the Quakers under the bondage of what is termed "Evangelical religion." They contend for true Gospel liberty, and claim to be the ancient, recognized and legal body of Friends. "They reject the doctrines of the *Trinity* and *Satisfaction*, and differ in nothing materially from the doctrines of Unitarian Christianity."

4. *Universalists in the United States.* — This is a widely-extending and active religious body. They have no less than 1194 societies in North America, and they agree in declaring that — 1. "God is one and indivisible, without a rival or an equal, and is alone to be worshipped with supreme adoration. 2. Jesus Christ is a created and dependent being, deriving his existence and all his power from God, who is his Father and the Father of all."

5. *Unitarianism in Canada.* — This is a short but interesting narrative of the progress of the doctrine, by the Rev. J. Cordner, now of Montreal. The first Unitarian congregation was formed in 1832, and in 1845 an Act passed the Canadian legislature "to incorporate the Montreal congregation of Christian Unitarians, and to authorize their minister to keep registers for births, baptisms, marriages and deaths, thus placing him in regard to these rights and privileges on a level with all clergymen in the

province." They have a handsome chapel, erected at a cost of £2400, and the Rev. J. Cordner is the stated minister. At Toronto, also, a society of Unitarian Christians has lately been formed under the ministry of the Rev. W. Adam, formerly of Calcutta. There are also many religious societies in Upper Canada connected with the "Christian" denomination; they have no less than twenty-six churches, and are all Anti-trinitarian in sentiment. The Universalists and Hicksite Quakers have also several regularly organized societies in Canada.

6. The longest and one of the most interesting essays is that on *Unitarianism in England*, from the able and judicious pen of the Rev. W. Turner, M. A., of Halifax. This article also comprises a history of *Unitarianism in Scotland* and a notice of *Dissenting Academies*. Of the latter, Mr. Turner says,

> "The history of the Dissenting Academies, commencing with that of Frankland, in 1670, and brought down through successive vicissitudes of struggle, prosperity, decline and subsequent revival, to the present day, might form one of the most interesting chapters in the history, not only of religion, but of mental cultivation in general in this country."

We could have wished that more had been said on this subject, and especially in respect of the Manchester New College. Surely this important institution deserved a separate article as much as the Carmarthen Academy, of which so full and interesting a history is given in a subsequent article. But Mr. Turner has been necessarily restricted by his limits from entering at large upon the many topics comprised in his sketch. Matter, indeed, sufficiently interesting and valuable might be found to fill a volume such as that before us upon this one subject of *Unitarianism in England*, and another upon *Dissenting Academies*, and we should rejoice if ad-

equate encouragement were given to treat upon these topics in all their details. Mr. Turner concludes his essay with some admirable remarks on the principles and present position of the Unitarian body, the careful consideration of which we would recommend not only to the Unitarians themselves, but to Christians of every denomination.

7. A short sketch of the history of the *Unitarian General Baptists*, from the same pen as the preceding essay, is the next article.

8. We scarcely think that *Anti-trinitarianism in England* demanded a separate chapter. The writer is one of a small, and we trust not increasing, sect among the Unitarians who believe that there is something better and stronger than historical testimony on which to ground their faith in Christianity. We need not remind our readers how ably and successfully the opinions of this sect have been combated by Dr. Beard himself in his valuable work entitled "The Voices of the Church." Since he has deemed it desirable to appropriate a portion of the present volume to the exposition of their views, we cannot but think that he has acted liberally and judiciously in allowing one of their advocates to speak for himself. This, certainly, has been done modestly and succinctly; but against the delusive and dangerous tendency of the opinions of this sect, we think that the voice of warning cannot be too often or too loudly uplifted; and more especially to the ears of young persons should that friendly voice be made to reach.

9. Of the rise of *Anti-trinitarian Churches in connexion with Joseph Barker*, a brief narrative — somewhat too brief — is furnished by the Rev. F. Howorth. Mr. Barker, as is well known, was formerly a preacher in the Methodist New-Connexion, from which he was expelled for alleged unsoundness

of doctrine. His ardor, intelligence and zeal were such as to lead to the secession of considerable numbers in Staffordshire and the North of England, who with their preachers have formed themselves into separate societies.

"There are at present two hundred societies, with an average of about thirty members each. There are varieties of opinion among them; but in general the doctrines of original depravity, satisfaction to Divine justice by a vicarious sacrifice, the Trinity, and justification by faith alone, have been displaced by the doctrine of the Divine Unity, and the free, unpurchased mercy of God, and the other tenets usually styled Unitarian."

10. *Anti-trinitarianism in the North of Ireland.* — A very satisfactory and encouraging account is here afforded by the Rev. John Blakely, A. M. But we are disappointed not to find a fuller account of the memorable proceedings which took place in the Irish Presbyterian Church, nearly twenty years since, when the revival of subscription to creeds and articles of faith compelled so many ministers with their congregations to leave the General Synod of Ulster and to form themselves into a Remonstrant Synod. The noble stand then made in defence of religious liberty by Henry Montgomery and other intrepid advocates cannot but be still fresh in the recollection of our readers.

"The number of Anti-trinitarians in the North of Ireland is now considerably above thirty thousand, who, it must be admitted, are among the most opulent, peaceable, loyal and best educated inhabitants of the country. In connexion with their congregations there are several well-enclosed burying-grounds; a number of efficient schools for giving instruction in general and classical education; many well-attended Sunday-schools for the accommodation and improvement of the children of the humbler classes; and a few libraries."

11. The article on *Anti-trinitarianism in the South of Ireland* is by the Rev. Dr. Ledlie, who candidly remarks that "Dublin and the South of Ireland are not favorable to the growth of any kind

of Protestant Dissent. The great mass of the people is Roman Catholic, and strongly wedded to and securely guarded in their religious opinions; and the aristocracy are principally of the Establishment."

12. *Carmarthen College, Wales.* — The history of this institution, which is one of the oldest Dissenting Academies in Great Britain, is ably written by the Rev. Dr. Thomas Rees. It originated more than a century and a half since, and has supplied the Principality and many of the Presbyterian pulpits of England with a succession of well-instructed and, generally speaking, liberal-minded ministers.

"It is the distinguishing characteristic of the Welsh Academy that, from its first institution, it has never restricted its education to students of any one denomination, or of any single creed. * * * In the appointment of tutors, also, the Board have acted with the same disregard to denominational and theological distinctions."

13. A brief notice of *Anti-trinitarianism in South Wales* next follows, from the pen of the Rev. David Lloyd, with a list of the congregations and their ministers in the Principality.

14. A beautiful article on the *Mission to the Poor* is furnished by the Rev. J. Johns, who gives a very pleasing account of the benevolent originator of the Ministry at Large, Joseph Tuckerman, and who well describes the plans and objects of this valuable institution. Eight of our cities have established a Mission — London, Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Birmingham, Bristol, Leicester and Halifax, and greatly should we rejoice to see the number extended.

"Qualifications," says Mr. Johns, "are requisite for this service, which cannot be expected to start up at every demand for them, or to be acquired by educational processes which have not had them distinctly or primarily in view. We have a ministry trained for the service of the educated classes; but we are rowing the boat with a single oar, until it is balanced by a trained ministry for the uninstructed and neglected."

15. A very valuable paper from the pen of the Editor next follows, on the subject of *Anti-trinitarianism in Germany.* The religious mind in that country is in a state of the utmost activity, and the most encouraging expectations may be entertained from all that is there passing. Dr. Beard quotes from the writings of Neander, Bretschneider and Wegscheider, three of the most eminent and influential divines in Germany, and shows that their opinions in common with the great bulk of the Protestant community, are Anti-trinitarian. Great associations have been formed for the promotion of religious knowledge and Christian benevolence, founded on the grand principles of religious liberty, in which Protestants of all denominations are embraced. Of one of these, "The Evangelical Union," or the "Gustavus-Adolphus Institution," founded in honor of the Swedish hero who lost his life in defence of religious liberty, Dr. Beard says,

"The existence and prosperity of this institution are to us among the most gratifying signs of the times. Surely, if any thing can, this society will contradict and put an end to the shameful misrepresentation which the self-satisfied orthodoxy of this land has long industriously spread abroad, alleging the lamentable condition of the German churches. Would that in this particular, at any rate, our English churches were equally near to Christ! And what Englishman, who has raised himself above the petty disputes of the several classes of creed Christians in these kingdoms, does not feel half-ashamed and deeply grieved when he contrasts the noble and truly Christian spirit of this great Association with the ludicrous littleness by signs of which he finds himself surrounded,—each tiny party, nay, (for in truth it comes to that,) each individual, requiring mankind to pronounce his shibboleth, or 'without doubt perish everlastingly.' A string of metaphysical propositions in one hand, the other pointing to the ever-burning flames of the bottomless pit, with these words—'This or That'—proceeding from his lips—such is the image of an Evangelical preacher in the nineteenth century! Not without reason, therefore, has the writer long since turned his hopes to the land of Luther, the birthplace of the Reformation, with the earnest and not altogethe

unauthorised desire that new light and a better spirit may come hence into this bigoted and distracted country."

The great Reformation in the Catholic Church recently commenced by Ronge, Czerski and others, is a remarkable event, not only in the history of the religion of Germany, but of Christianity. The essential characteristic of this reformed "German Catholic Church" is religious liberty; but the records of their proceedings prove that it holds Anti-trinitarian opinions. The new Reformation is spreading rapidly, and the results will undoubtedly be most favorable to the interests of pure religion.

16. The next article, on the *French Protestant Church*, is also supplied by the Editor. This Church is divided into two classes, the *Exclusives* and the *Liberals*. "The latter is the national and predominant party."

"The exclusives are Trinitarians, while those who are liberal in spirit, though they may differ from one another in minor points, and hold dissimilar views touching the person of Christ, are, in the broad sense of the term, Unitarians. The French Protestant Church, in regard to its outward relations, consists of two divisions, the Reformed Church and the Lutheran Church; a distinction that is founded in historical considerations which have now nearly lost their importance. Of these two, comprising about two millions of souls, the Reformed is by far the larger, having 485 ministers, while the Lutheran division has 244. How many have renounced the Trinity, we have not the means to determine with exactness. Facts, however, within our knowledge, give us reason to think that not more than two hundred of these clergymen still hold the doctrine in any form."

17. *Anti-trinitarianism in Transylvania* is a highly interesting essay, written by a distinguished member of the Unitarian church in that country, and translated by John Paget, Esq., who has added several useful notes. The Unitarians of this country are about 50,000 in number; they are protected by the Government, and

"— are no longer disturbed in those rights and privileges which have so often been assured to them by the laws. They enjoy the same liberties with the other established religions, and two of the highest posts under Government are at present filled by Unitarians."

18. *Anti-trinitarianism in Geneva.*—In this article, which is written by the Editor, we had hoped to find fuller details on the subject of a church so interesting as that of Geneva, and in which so many important events have occurred.

"The Genevan is a national church, represented by a body designated 'La Venerable Compagnie des Pasteurs de l'Eglise Génévoise,' which consists of thirty clerical members, who govern the university as well as the church. This venerable company has no formal confession of faith. The greater number of its members, while they hold a supernatural form of Christianity, have given up the old ecclesiastical doctrines. The ministers assume no other obligation in regard to their teachings than is involved in these words: 'I swear to preach purely and fully the Word of God, as it is contained in the Holy Scriptures.' Generally, among Swiss Protestants, the old doctrines of the creeds find few adherents in the clergy or the people."

19. A very brief article on *English Unitarian Writers* is supplied by the Rev. W. Turner, M. A., followed by a list of *Publications* from which a knowledge of Unitarian Christianity may be obtained. Many names and works are omitted which we might have expected to find noticed — but we are aware that in so limited a space it was difficult to make a selection.

20. *A list of Unitarian Congregations and Ministers in England and Scotland* is necessarily imperfect, but it is nevertheless an interesting and encouraging document.

21. *Manchester New College — its Officers and Regulations* — concludes the volume: and we cannot but repeat our wish that the Editor had subjoined to this paper a fuller history of this institution than has hitherto appeared.

We have thus gone cursorily over the contents of this very instructive and useful work. Many of the articles of which it is composed are mere sketches, and leave us wishing to know more. Indeed, each of the essays might appropriately form the groundwork for a separate book. In respect of Unitarianism in our own country, we should have been glad of fuller and more statistical details. Our Sunday-schools and other institutions for the education of the poorer classes,—our numerous associations for the diffusion of religious knowledge and the promotion of benevolent objects,—would have furnished matter for many important pages; and in a future edition of this work, which we hope and expect will be required, Dr. Beard will have many things to add and some things to alter. Our American brethren publish annually a Unitarian Almanac, in which statistical and other information of almost every kind that can be desired respecting Transatlantic Unitarianism is given in detail; and we do not see why the present work, or some portions of it may not occasionally or periodically be presented to the public, containing all that information which the lapse of time and the progress of events will render necessary. Meanwhile, our best thanks are due to Dr. Beard for the valuable matter he has here collected together, and for the encouragement which is thus afforded to the lovers of Christian truth and liberty to persevere with zeal and energy in the great work which is given them to do.

[From the Christian Reformer, No. 23 — London, November, 1846.]

GERMANY.

RONGE AND THE NEW REFORMATION.

The appearance of Czerski at the meetings in London of the Evangelical Alliance, which excited surprise and regret in the minds of the friends of religious progress, is now explained by the fact, that, owing mainly to external influence, his vascillations have been brought to an end, and he has not only resolved to be as orthodox as he can be, but to avoid acting in common with the straightforward and faithful Ronge. In order to put the reader into a condition to comprehend the actual state of things, we may be allowed to mention one or two facts of an earlier date. In the spring of the present year, a reconciliation took place between Czerski and Ronge, who, retaining the differences of opinion in theology which had caused an alienation, now agreed to act harmoniously together for the furtherance of the great purposes of religious reform, in regard to which they were of one mind. This reconciliation gave pleasure to the great majority of the members of the German Catholic Church, who, agreeing with Ronge in opinion, are not so narrow as to exclude from their sympathy fellow-Christians that differ from them in speculative matters, and are desirous of forming a great and united body of enlightened men and women on the simple recognition of "Jesus, the Saviour," and for the great purpose of promoting a religious reform, in the spirit of Christ. Another party were vexed and grieved at the reconciliation. The orthodox sects of this country, with some countenance from the Establishment, have long been actively engaged in endeavoring to diffuse their opinions in Germany. The movement of Ron-

they had hailed in hope that it would serve their purposes. On trial, Ronge proved to be too liberal in his caste of thought. Hence they began to assail and misrepresent him. While doing so, they turned to Czerski. At the very moment that the prospect seemed favorable, that Reformer, influenced by considerations arising within the churches of the "New Reformation," agreed to sink differences and unite with Ronge. Such a disappointment was not to be quietly endured by men of zeal so burning. Every effort was therefore made in order to disturb this good understanding and sunder the alliance, the rather since these orthodox zealots were preparing for a grand display in the metropolis; and it was worth a little trouble to be able to give people some reason to think that the German Reformation was one with them. Meanwhile, the dissension originated and fostered by Czerski and English gold, displayed itself in the declaration of a *quasi* orthodox creed by a community at Berlin, who, with Jettmar and Beyer at their head, are known under the designation of *Protest-Katholiken*, or Protesting Catholics. Diversities of view led to heats in debate. The necessity of satisfying English zealotism, if English patronage was to be enjoyed, gave the minds of Czerski and his adherents a false direction and a powerful impulse. It was resolved to hold a conference. It took place at Schneidemühl. Here the Trinitarians conspired to make a grand effort in order to get a recognition of some form of Trinitarianism. A warm debate ensued. Dr. Jettmar pleaded for the imposition, as obligatory, of a creed professing faith in the Trinity in Unity. The Synod at large, with its President, Post, maintained on the contrary that they should acknowledge solely one God, who revealed himself by Jesus Christ, eternally perfect, whom we know through the influence of

the Holy Spirit. Finding themselves in a hopeless minority, the Protesting Catholics withdrew, but left a sting behind; for as they retired they gave the Synod an assurance that the governments would never acknowledge them unless they avowed a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity. This declaration, which seems to have meant more than it said, was regarded by the Synod as a threat, and called forth a warm protest, as being a consideration which ought not to have been entertained by those who had uttered it, much less thrust on the notice of the assembly. Thus defeated, the semi-orthodox gave out a report that Ronge and his friends were little else than infidels; and, to support their calumny, affirmed that Post, the President, had spoken in terms of disrespect of the Apostles' Creed. This imputation Post has denied, stating that what he said was, that the Apostles' Creed was a concise abstract of the Scriptures, and that it accorded with his own views, and with those of the community he represented.

The efforts which Czerski had made, deserved some reward. He received his reward in what, we hope, was a pleasant journey to London; and in a reception which must have been annoying and humiliating. On arriving in the metropolis, he was consigned to the custody of the Rev. R. Herschell, who received him with suspicion, frankly telling him, that while he was glad to afford him hospitality, he could not extend to him the right hand of Christian brotherhood. Such a welcome was followed by a close watching of a fortnight in length. Having received Czerski with "all the suspicions that a man could feel against a brother," and kept a sharp eye on him for fourteen days, our orthodox Argus at length brings the suspected reformer before a meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, and gives his

good character as to the general qualities of his mind and heart. But is he orthodox? In order to enable our Protestant inquisitors to judge in this matter, Czerski is requested to pronounce "Shibboleth." He makes an attempt, and is condemned. In this attempt he did all a man could do for his purpose, by assailing the Roman Catholics and dealing in generalities. It was of no avail. "Old birds are not caught with straws," and they cast him out. And so Czerski became a solitary wanderer in the streets of London. He tried to gain, and has forever lost, the favor of both parties. He gave up Ronge to please the Evangelical Alliance; and that bigoted association, not finding him to their mind, gave him leave to go at large.

There is one comfort in these unhappy proceedings. Czerski is now known, and can no longer complicate the relations and disturb the movements of the New Reformation, which will thus be left free to develop its own tendencies and accomplish its important work.

[From the Inquirer, No. 226—London, October, 1846.]

STATE OF RELIGION IN GERMANY.

Our new German correspondent, from whose papers we anticipate gratification to ourselves and our readers, and to whom we are much indebted for his desire to use his peculiar means of information for the benefit of the readers of our Journal, seems to us to need to have his conclusions, and his views of what he observed, received with considerable caution; and whilst introducing to our readers, Dr.

BEARD's valuable essay, we have felt urged immediately to point out some matters respecting which we cannot but question the correctness of his views. We are inclined to think that he rather overstates the ignorance and want of interest in relation to religious movements in Germany, which he attributes to the people of this country. At least, as far as concerns Unitarians, we think not only that all information has been thankfully accepted, but that much that is valuable has been obtained, and the whole subject has occupied much attention. There is, of course, amongst us, by no means an entire sympathy with the direction of thought in Germany, but we feel all the importance of the changes that are going on; we watch them with interest, and endeavor to estimate them fairly. We see in them, much which we wish to encourage by our sympathy; and from every effort of earnest thought in the spirit of freedom, we confidently hope for ultimate good.

We by no means admit, without reserve, our correspondent's view of the opposite characteristics of England and Germany. We attribute the comparative neglect of certain branches of science usually regarded as more *speculative* than others, in this country — though we deny that those branches are really different in nature from others in which our country eminently excels — to a different cause. We deny that those amongst us, who have given themselves to such pursuits, exhibit any marked deficiency, as compared with the philosophers of other countries, and we affirm that the reason of the comparative neglect is, that the sciences we refer to are chiefly interesting from their inherent value, and their connection with the improvement of our race, individually and socially — whilst the sciences which attract our money-lovin

countrymen are those which have been connected artificially with honor and wealth, or which lead to wealth by their direct influence on *external* and *material* improvements. We recognize no incapacity for profound thought and its successful application in that region which sometimes receives, preëminently, the name of Philosophy—but we are obliged to acknowledge, that amongst us, both in the way of hope and fear, powerful motives are employed to draw our youth to other subjects and to deter them from this. We lament the effect, but do not admit that what there is of English philosophy, free from the influence of sectarian religion, is of low value, and certainly not, that the Germans have fallen on the right method of philosophizing, or advanced much the boundaries of definite and established science in the region of mind.

Our correspondent alleges want of progress (even among Unitarians), in England, in religious science. We agree with him in his condemnation of all attempts to hold people to a fixed standard, and to account deviation from it an offence, whether occurring—as sometimes they do—among Unitarians, or elsewhere. We agree in the feeling that the application of deep study and earnest thought to Christianity, must carry us forward—for whatever we may consider to have been done, few will pretend that we understand all things perfectly—that there is nothing to be learned as to the true meaning of passages in the Christian records; as to the manner in which Christianity is designed to influence our condition; or as to the practical results of carrying out and applying its principles. We acknowledge that even the freest body of Christians in this country has suffered greatly from the want of the motives supplied by the peculiar state of things in Germany, for aiming at profound theo-

logical learning and original independent investigation — but we believe that the peculiar condition, in this respect, of Germany, has also brought with it its own evils—exciting men to a sort of race in novelty-hunting, and presenting most dangerous temptations to extravagance of opinions, and to a not strictly faithful use of ancient authorities. The permission to men, without feeling themselves injured by it, openly to profess and maintain all that they think is an unspeakable blessing — but custom and connivance allowing a man *really* to affirm or deny what he pleases, whilst, *politically*, he cannot found a new sect or place himself in open hostility to existing churches — has a miserable effect in undermining sentiments of candor and honesty — placing men in false positions, and preventing the practical application by them, of what they believe. These are some of the evils connected with the state of theology in Germany, which are to be balanced against our wrong tendencies.

Again, we must hold — and here is our most important difference from him — that our correspondent has not given a satisfactory account of the distinctions among German theologians, termed *Rationalism* and *Supernaturalism*. We do not object to him merely because his own sympathies do not go with ours, but because it seems to us, that, influenced by his own sympathies, he does not fairly express the opinions and position of important parties. When "R. P. B." (we beg his pardon for our printers having misread his initials,) states, that "the almost universal opinion among English Christians is, that the reception, at least, of the New Testament as a supernatural revelation from above, and the consequent unconditional acceptation of all that it contains, form the outermost boundaries of Christianity," he is mistaken. Very few Unitar-

Christians believe the New Testament to be supernaturally given from above, or suppose that nothing in it is to be called in question. But it is quite true, that few indeed who pretend to the Christian name in England, exclude the *supernatural* from Christianity. Some deny its necessity, or its power, *as evidence.* Some few may doubt its external manifestation by miracle at all — but it is almost universally agreed, that Christianity is a direct communication from God, not a result of the working of the human mind, according to its ordinary laws, and that in this is its essence — that to acknowledge Christ as a good man, or a reformer, or a genius, and as such, like other great geniuses, a manifestation of God, is not to admit what Christ and his immediate followers claimed, or what constitutes the essential value of the religious system — and that, consequently, here is properly taken the distinction between a believer and an unbeliever in Christianity — not that the most liberal Christians pretend to any authority to decide what a man shall or shall not call himself, or desire power to reject any man from the pale of the Church, but simply, that such is the opinion prevailing among the freest and most inquiring Christians in this country, as to the reasonable and useful distinction between a Christian believer and an opponent of Christianity, and those who reject *this* distinction, in fact deny that there is any at all; by which change of language we see nothing gained to any party. The sentence quoted above, from our correspondent, might easily be modified, so as to be correct as a statement of fact — thus; "the reception of at least the New Testament, as *containing* a supernatural revelation from above, and the consequent unconditional reception of all the principles or precepts which can be proved from it properly to belong to this revelation."

Attaching, ourselves, the highest importance to miracles, as the proper and philosophical evidence of Divine communication, we must yet admit that *if the communication be believed on other grounds*, it would be most unreasonable to make the reception of the particular kind of proof a test of sufficient belief in Christianity; but belief in Christianity, and denial of the supernatural, means just what belief at the same time in Mahomedanism and various forms of Paganism means, or at most only implies some admiration of Christ's doctrines, as *in our* opinion good — not taking him as our guide. If in Germany, or elsewhere, men call themselves Christians, who believe Christ to have had no more authority than any other good and wise man, or than our own approbation gives to his precepts, we think it evident that this is an abuse of words, which destroys all useful distinction of opinions whatever; but perhaps it is only meant, that Christianity is a conventional term, to which it is not desirable to assign any distinct meaning, and that the terms *Supernaturalism* and *Anti-supernaturalism*, *Orthodoxy* and *Rationalism*, amply express all that is required. We must earnestly desire that the name *Christian* should continue to have a meaning, though we also as sincerely wish to guard from all injury or insult, on account of their opinions, those who refuse to take it; but, at least, it is very necessary that the terms substituted as the signs of distinctions of opinion, should be well understood and fairly used. Our correspondent's definition of *Supernaturalism* contains particulars which all Unitarians reject; and he opposes to this, *Rationalism*, of which his representation is such as again to exclude the generality of Unitarians from this division, leaving them no place in which to stand. Unitarians, speaking of them as a bod

and endeavoring to use words in their proper sense, for the purpose of distinction, are supernaturalists, for they believe in a *Divine revelation*. They are also *Rationalists*, for they reject an authoritative standard of faith, and maintain the right of individual judgment, and the necessity for the use of reason in the affairs of religion. Unitarians embrace their religion as being not merely supported by reasonable evidence, but itself conformable to reason, and acceptable to our natural faculties when most properly exercised. They value the *authority* of revelation, which depends on the supernatural element, as supporting reason, not opposing it. But coming to the matter of fact, we are led to believe, on what we deem very sufficient authority, that in Germany, among the liberal and rationalistic party, there is a large and increasing portion of supernaturalism, or belief in a real divine communication. That is, that there is in Germany a large and increasing body, including some great names, whose position corresponds, in essential particulars, with that of the English Unitarians. Let the anti-supernaturalist rationalists receive fair play, and all due attention, and so far as they are honest men, lovers of truth and free inquiry, and ready to concede the right of free inquiry to others, let them be honored; but let it not be assumed that they only are celebrated and deserving of honor amongst the learned of their country, and that they are entitled to be set up as examples of the most profound philosophy and the most distinguished learning.

We believe that the adoption of essentially false views in mental science is the cause of their much-to-be-deprecated error in religion. We wish them to be fairly understood and judged, and are glad of all additional light respecting their views; but we should deeply regret, if an extravagant and unrea-

sonable admiration of them should shake the faith of our ardent youth in Divine revelation, the value of which, to frail and erring man, we cannot well conceive to be over-estimated. We are sure that our correspondent, as a lover of truth, will excuse the freedom of these remarks, which we feel that his first letter calls for from us. We do not take up the subject in a controversial spirit, or attempt here to test all the opinions he has advanced; but we felt that we should not do our duty to our readers, without pointing out some things in his letter, which seem to us calculated to mislead.

LITERARY EXTRACTS.

THE ARABS.

The Arabs are thin and active. In their eating, they practise moderation; they do not use wheaten bread, but are content with bread made of grain termed dôura, in the shape of round cakes. Pillau, made of rice, is their common food. Coffee is a general beverage. Wine and other intoxicating drinks are taken only in secret, in consequence of the prohibition in the Koran. The smoking of tobacco is customary with all classes. Little time is consumed in eating the meal, which, even in the houses of distinction, is taken on the floor; a piece of cloth or leather serving for a table. The duties of knives, forks, and spoons are performed by the fingers. The hands, therefore, are carefully washed before food is taken; for the Arabs are very studious of cleanliness. This and their moderation in eating, conduces very much to the good health

which they enjoy. With the exception of the leprosy, few chronic diseases affect them. Their medical men are generally very ignorant. They attach much importance to the anointing of the body. With those who are well off, perfumes and perfumed water are very common, both of which are offered to friends on their arrival. The Arabs are very companionable, on which account they love to assemble in coffee-houses, in the market places; and in Yemen, there is scarcely any village but has its market place. The female sex, as in all the east, live retired, inhabiting the back part of the house; the women of a family are never seen by a stranger. The education of children is in their early years confided to the female sex; when the sons are grown up, they either come under their father's instruction, or are placed under a tutor. The girls remain in the harem till they are married. In regard to wedlock, great care is taken to ascertain that the intended bride is a virgin. If the contrary appears, expulsion, and even death, is the resource. Arabs are celebrated for hospitality, whatever their condition in life. They are courteous even to an extreme, and in cities kind to strangers. Professors of other religions are not rudely exposed to insult. The Arabs seek not to make proselytes, though they show favor to those who pass over to Mohammed. They are generally, and not without reason, described as revengeful. The old custom of blood for blood is unhappily kept up; but they are not quarrelsome, and slight offences are easily forgiven. — *The People's Dictionary of the Bible.*

REFUSAL OF FUNERAL RIGHTS TO NONCONFORMISTS.

"*Warminster, Nov.* 2, 1846.—The meeting of the Board of Guardians, at which it was specially appointed to take into consideration what measures should be adopted in consequence of the refusal of the Rev. A. Fane, Vicar of Warminster, to inter, with the usual rites of burial, Sarah Garrett, a pauper belonging to the parish, was held this day, and an unusually full Board attended, several who came but rarely to the meetings having presented themselves on the occasion.

"The Chairman of the Board, John Ravenhill, Esq., presided, and the business was introduced by the Vice-Chairman, Mr. W. Morgan, who in an able and appropriate address stated the circumstances of the case, and concluded by moving a resolution to the effect, that the Board, in their capacity of Guardians of the Poor, thought it incumbent on them to take Mr. Fane's refusal into consideration, and to lay all the circumstances connected with the case before the Bishop. The motion was seconded by the Right Hon. Lord Heytesbury, who, at considerable length, advocated the necessity and propriety of the interference of the Board. The Chairman, also, John Ravenhill, Esq., supported the motion, in a speech of much eloquence and energy.

"An earnest and lengthened discussion ensued, in which some of the Guardians expressed their opinion, that the Board was not called upon to interfere, and an amendment was moved by Mr. Pocock, of Thoulstone Farm, which was seconded by Mr. Cockrell, to the effect that the Board should not interfere, but the amendment was negatived; and afterwards the original resolution was carried by a majority of 13 to 8. The eldest son of the poor

woman came from a distance to present himself before the Board, and in a strong manner expressed the abhorrence of himself and his family, that their mother should have been thrust into a hole as if she had been a murderer; and earnestly hoped the Board would take measures that the funeral service might yet be read over her grave, and if it could be, however distant, he would attend.

"Amidst the increasing pretensions and novel assumption of consequence and authority by some of the clergy of the present day, and the lamentable apathy and supineness in which so many of the laity suffer themselves to be driven and hoodwinked, it is refreshing to see that in the Warminster Board of Guardians there is still to be found one body disposed to withstand such illegal and arbitrary proceedings as have taken place in the case of this poor widow.

"*November* 10th.—It is understood that the Chairman has, in compliance with the Resolution of the Board, transmitted the Resolution and Statement of the Case to the Bishop. His Lordship's reply is anxiously expected, and it is earnestly hoped it may be of a nature to allay the excitement produced by Mr. Fane's unwarrantable conduct, and prevent the necessity of any further proceedings."

THE

UNITARIAN.

[From the Christian Reformer — London, January, 1847.]

MAN'S ENMITY TO GOD.*

We know not whether our readers would thank us for devoting to this singular work a space proportioned to its extent, to the striking nature of its doctrines, or even to the talent which in some respects it undoubtedly exhibits. The title of the book is startling enough; and the first sentence, which runs as follows, still more so: "Enmity to God is not merely a quality of human nature, but constitutes the very basis, principle or essence of human nature. This is a truth of which the great majority of mankind is profoundly ignorant; and a truth which, when brought under their notice, is by many systematically rejected." "Socinians," he adds, (taking that term, we presume, in its usual popular acceptation,) "absolutely loathe it." He is perfectly right; we plead guilty to the sentiment; and if he could have found a stronger expression by which to characterize our repugnance, we would

* The Three Grand Exhibitions of Man's Enmity to God. By David Thom, Bold-Street Chapel, Liverpool. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 8vo. pp. 558.

equally have admitted it. We know not how adequately to describe our utter want of sympathy with the strange propensity which so many display thus to slander the nature which God has given them, and revile their fellow-creatures who bear it along with themselves. We have been accustomed to regard human nature as the most excellent and glorious of all the works of God which are laid open to our view; as created in the image of its Maker; as endowed with mental and moral faculties which enable man to cultivate this image in his soul by a devout contemplation of the works, the providence, and the word of God. True, he has fallen lamentably short of what might have been expected; there is not one of the human race that has not often been guilty of folly and of sin. Nay, even of those who, in a perversion (as we deem it) of Scripture phraseology, flatter themselves that they are among the "elect," called to be saints, members of the church of Christ here, and set apart to rise with him in the glory of his kingdom hereafter, — there is not one, we presume, even of these holy men, who will venture to say that he is altogether perfect. But what then? Shall we say that all those who are thus from time to time transgressors of the law of God, are therefore enemies to him? God forbid!

With respect to the present world, we have been accustomed to regard it as provided by its almighty and beneficent Creator to be the school of discipline and improvement for his rational offspring; and have derived, as we thought, both pleasure and advantage from tracing the analogy of the divine dispensations of our gracious moral Governor in this respect; contemplating with admiration, on the one hand, the wise adaptation of the outward circumstances and social position of *each individual* to his

original constitution, with its tendency to develop the most elevated principles of his intellectual and moral nature, the germs of which lay dormant in the infant mind, — and, on the other, the progress of *the race*, from infancy to maturity, with the agency of Divine Providence, both in its ordinary and extraordinary manifestations, to exalt, refine and purify those principles of human nature by which, as one generation succeeds to another and learns wisdom from the accumulated experience of ages, illustrated by the discoveries of revelation, mankind are gradually placed in circumstances more and more favorable to present happiness and improvement, better fitted for training spirits for admission to a heavenly state.* If Mr. Thom is right, all this is a gross and pernicious delusion; and in cherishing this pleasing speculation, so well adapted, as it seems to be, to raise our idea of man, the work of God, and fill us with love and gratitude to the All-wise Disposer, we are only betraying our rooted enmity to him. According to him, it would appear that the condition of man in the present state is altogether hopeless, and that the main, if not the only, purpose of the measures of Divine Providence with regard to the human race, is more clearly to demonstrate this melancholy and deplorable fact. Human nature, as he repeats over and over again, is decidedly and radically in a state of enmity to its Maker, — an enmity whose utter depravity, intensity and inveteracy, is beyond description, and which the progress of civilization, the gradual development of the human mind, and even the in-

* See Dr. Priestley's admirable Essay on the Analogy of the Divine Dispensations, — a performance in which, if the author of this work could be prevailed upon to study it, he would find, if we mistake not, some ideas at once new and not undeserving of his attention.

creasing study and more accurate knowledge of the divine word, only serve to display in darker colors, and to unfold in all its "devilish malignity."

In conformity with these views of the nature which God has given him, the dispensations of Providence respecting religion, as they may be traced in Scripture and in the subsequent history of the human race, present, according to our author, the progress and results of three "experiments," which constitute what he denominates in the title of his book, the "three grand exhibitions of man's enmity to God." The first experiment, as may be anticipated, was that made on Adam in Paradise. Here it will be observed, that our author does not fall into the inconsistency of the common orthodox creeds, which represent Adam as originally created "in righteousness, purity and holiness," as a specimen of human nature in its highest state of perfection, when its Maker blessed and called it good, notwithstanding that he was at the same time so weak as to give way at the first access of a temptation to which, in these degenerate, "fallen" days, a child would be ashamed to have yielded. No; Adam was essentially neither better nor worse, in these respects, than his descendants after him. "Human nature is in all the same. What it was in Adam, it is in every one of his descendants. What it was six thousand years ago, it has all along been, is now, and will continue to the end of time. 'Sans changer,' is its appropriate motto. It is in all, enmity to God. Nothing more, nothing less."—Preface, p. 15.

This is at least intelligible and consistent. But the question cannot fail to present itself, Whence came this human nature? Who made man; and from whom do the successive generations of men derive their existence, with a nature fundamentally

and essentially hostile to God? The answer to this question cannot fail, we should think, to confound and perplex the thoughtful inquirer, who is conscious in himself of no such rooted enmity to his Maker, but is desirous, on the contrary, to cherish gratitude and love to him for many mercies and opportunities of improvement, though not feeling authorized to claim for himself any peculiar and special dispensation of Divine grace. Such a one would be disposed to ask himself the question, Which of the two is to be rejected — the dictates of my own consciousness and observation, or those principles of interpretation which profess to deduce from detached and scattered texts of Scripture a conclusion like this? And he will repel indignantly the reply of our author, that such doubts and objections are only the suggestions of the "mind of flesh," the produce of "carnal reason." What other reason (he will say) can I exercise, than that which my Maker has given me? By what other means, than by the principles which it supplies and suggests, can I judge of your interpretations of Scripture, or even of the authority of the documents themselves, which claim to contain the word of God?

The "experiment" made upon Adam completely failed; or rather, as our author would say, answered its true purpose, of demonstrating, as far as a single individual and a single instance could do it, the enmity of man to God, and his repugnance to obey a law, though imposed by Divine authority. But it might be said, the proof is too limited; the conclusion from one example to the entire race, is inadmissible. Instead of an individual, then, a nation was selected as the subject of the next experiment, and a longer period of actual trial given, extending from the call of Abraham to the final destruction of Jerusalem. The

earlier, and by much the larger portion of this period, which preceded the advent of the Messiah, was, however, in our author's view, merely preparatory, "paving the way for that second grand experiment, the opportunity for making which was to arise from the death and resurrection of Christ, and the preaching of the gospel by the apostles." During the first of these periods, the law imposed is said to have been chiefly of a prohibitory character.

"Before Christ appeared and died, *thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness*. and in general, *thou shalt not refuse to hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God*, and if thou transgressest these or any of these prohibitions, thou shalt in one form or another incur the punishment of forfeiture or loss, (Deut. xxviii. 15–68), is the language, and is expressive of the spirit, of the laws addressed by God to his chosen people. All, all was prohibitory; and all, in the event of transgression taking place, breathed threatenings of the forfeiture of temporal blessings already enjoyed. Enmity to God was thus, throughout the whole period in question, displayed on the part of man, in the form of violating divine prohibition. Rom. v. 20; vii. 7." — Page 88.

From the stress which is laid in various places on this distinction between prohibition and positive command, we suppose it is a point of some importance to our author's view of this whole subject; but how it is made out, we do not see. It is true that some of the moral precepts are expressed in a negative form, as is the case with those cited in this passage; but they are not on that account less positive in their character; and whatever may be thought of the letter, the spirit of the commandment is by no means fully carried out by merely refraining from certain specific acts; it implies the actual performance of many services tending to maintain the social relations to which they refer, — to say nothing of the dispositions of mind from which these services naturally spring, and which are comprised in the gospel exposition and extension

of several of these precepts.* The maxim, "Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths," gives the same precept, first negatively, and then repeated in a positive form. The ceremonial law consists in a great measure, not of prohibitions, but of positive ordinances. "Thou shalt not refuse to hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God" is equivalent to the positive command, Thou shalt hearken, &c. This, however, seems to us a mere verbal nicety on which we should lay no stress, though our author evidently does. But what can we understand by the assertion, (p. 80,) that, "properly speaking, all these prohibitions were addressed, not to the people of Israel, but to the Messiah himself, emphatically the Israelite or Jew, in whom that people was summed up, and in the hands of whom as Mediator the whole law was ordained, Gal. iii. 19"?

"The Old-Testament Scriptures," he tells us in another place (p. 104), "may be fitly represented as the *mould* into which it behoved the whole mind and procedure, every thought and every action, of the second or heavenly man," (meaning the Messiah), "as the rule or standard to which in every part of his life and conversation he should conform himself.† They were the Messiah's law; a law stringent and severe; requiring the most minute and exact obedience, and permitting not the slightest deviation from either the letter or the spirit of its enactments. This law, so different from the mild, may I not rather say, the intentionally trifling form in which divine law had been issued to the first man, it was absolutely necessary that Jesus, the second man, should without the least flaw or mistake fulfil."

All this, and much more in the same strain, he asks, "who that *knows the truth as it is in Jesus*

---

* Matt. v. 21, 27.

† "Psalm cxix., which is a detail of the experience *of the Messiah*, while in the flesh, frequently alludes to this. Read carefully from verse 89 to verse 118."

will dispute?" If this is to be the criterion, we fear the parties whom our author will recognize as worthy of so honorable a designation will form but a little flock. For ourselves, we are of course disqualified on many other grounds for admission into the sacred enclosure; and therefore, having nothing to lose, we run no risk in avowing our utter dissent from this view, either of the purpose of the Jewish law, or of the character of the Messiah, to whom, we are told, it was especially, and in a certain sense exclusively, addressed. The objection most frequently urged against our Lord by the Pharisees and others, was his apparent disregard of minute outward observances; and though it may be true that many of these derived their only authority from human tradition, yet this was by no means universally the case; and, till now, we should have thought and said with confidence, that no one could read the narratives of the life of Christ upon earth with ordinary attention, and imagine that its distinguishing feature was a strict, rigid, and undeviating adherence to the ritual law of Moses.

We are apt, however, to suspect, on further consideration, that we have been mistaken in our view of this matter. It would seem to be, not the *ritual* merely, but the *moral* precepts of the old law, which our author means to represent as designed, not for the Jews collectively, still less for mankind at large, but for the Messiah and for him alone. Certainly, in his sweeping assertions on this subject, no distinction is hinted at between these two branches of the law, and the examples which he cites are derived fully as much from the one as from the other. The law, considered in this peculiar point of view, is represented expressly (p. 106) as being summed up in these words, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and

with all thy mind; and, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Such, says our author, was the law given by God *to Jesus Christ.*

"When this is apprehended by us, we are at no loss to appreciate the real state and condition of Abraham's descendants according to the flesh, during the period which elapsed previous to the appearance and death of the Messiah. They were a people in every respect subsidiary and subservient to that glorious personage. True, they might commit sin and incur punishment; because, in a certain though *subordinate* sense, the law of Moses was obligatory on them. But in reality, during the whole interval between the giving of the law and the coming of the Messiah, they were under the Messiah's protection (Psalm lxxxiv. 9), as the person to whom the law was properly speaking addressed, and by whom in due time it was to be fulfilled. Their breaches of the law were his; for though personally sinless, he was wounded for their transgressions, and bruised for their iniquities. His righteousness was theirs; for as the true Abraham, and thereby one with them, his fulfilment of the law was equivalent to their fulfilment of it. Acts iii. 26, xiii. 38, 39; 2 Cor. v. 21; 1 Peter ii. 24. Every stroke of justice *aimed* at them, thus passed through them to him, the true victim of divine *vengeance* [so the almighty avenger, it would seem, missed his aim!]; and every blessing promised to obedience redounded back from him, the fulfiller of the law, to them as one with him, and as having thereby an interest in his fulfilment of it; *conditionally*, to be sure; that is, the Jews were to realize the blessedness flowing from the Messiah's obedience only if they believed on him."—P. 107.

"Christ's fulfilment of the law was equivalent to their fulfilment of it." (As authority for this, we are referred to Acts iii. 26.) "God, having raised up his Son, sent him unto you first, to bless you *in turning away every one of you from his iniquities*"!

However strange and extravagant all this may sound to our ears, it is in perfect conformity with the representation which the author afterwards gives of the gospel dispensation as in no sense a covenant of works, involving no practical precept or command whatsoever, but simply this, that we believe in and accept the *absolutely unconditional* gift of God of eternal life. As the enmity of the Jews, in the second experiment or "grand exhibition," was

displayed, not in their neglect at all times of those weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy and fidelity, but simply in their refusal, after the death and resurrection of Jesus, to believe in him as the promised Messiah in obedience to the preaching of the apostles, — so, in later times, the concentrated essence of malignity is exemplified by the obstinate perseverance of mankind in the persuasion that their salvation is to a certain extent dependent on their own good works.

Mr. Thom is profuse in his citations of, or rather references to Scripture; in fact, his whole system is built on that sort of *textual* criticism which is still too much a favorite with almost all parties; proceeding in a great measure upon that notion of plenary verbal inspiration which sees in every sentence and clause of every book and chapter, both of the Old and the New Testament, the immediate dictation of the Holy Spirit. It is needless for us to say that we regard this notion as altogether gratuitous and inconsistent with phenomena which must force themselves, we should think, on the attention of every careful student of Scripture. There is no doctrine, however absurd and extravagant, which may not be supported with abundance of apparent scriptural authority by such a mode of dealing with the sacred writings as we see practised in this volume on an extensive scale. We do not pretend to have examined, or even turned to, all his references; but of the large number which we *have* examined, the greater part appear to us to have no connection whatever with his argument, and when compared with the context, and illustrated by the information we obtain from other quarters respecting the intentions and views of the writers, they will be found to relate to an entirely different subject. A very large portion of them, as may be

anticipated, are derived from St. Paul's Epistles, and refer to circumstances and questions connected with the controversies and parties of those times, which are now altogether out of date. Their chief interest to us arises from the light they afford us in tracing the history of the early propagation of the gospel, and the character and views of its first preachers.

It will be seen that the fundamental principle of our author's theological system is the diametrical opposition of man to God, not only in the actual commission of sin, but in his very nature itself, and consequently in all his feelings, tendencies, desires and pursuits. To prove this he cites such texts as the following: Rom. viii. 7, "The carnal mind is enmity against God;" Gal. v. 17, "The flesh hath desires contrary to the spirit, and the spirit contrary to the flesh;" Matt. xvi. 23, "Get thee behind me, Satan, for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men." Now we should say, that any one who looks at these texts in their connection, and with a single grain of common sense, will at once perceive that they have nothing to do with the subject. The "carnal mind" of which the apostle speaks, is not the original, but an acquired character; not the attribute of humanity in general, but of the particular individuals or classes of whom he was then speaking; the result of rooted prejudices, of confirmed habits of vice, and the indulgence of sensual appetites and worldly desires. "The flesh hath desires contrary to the spirit;" that is, the prevailing dispositions and pursuits of heathens, and of worldly-minded, unbelieving Jews, are contrary to the spirit of Christianity; and the apostle exhorts them to walk after the spirit, to govern their lives no longer according to the habits and practices of unbelievers, but by

the spirit and precepts of the gospel. Mr. Thom proceeds (p. 501) to point out marks of this enmity in the violation, not merely of the express laws of God, but of the law of conscience. But is not conscience (considered, as it must be in this connection, independently of the Divine law) a part of our nature, or at least the result of natural reason, tracing out practical rules from a careful consideration of the consequences of our conduct, or, as is more commonly the case, influenced by the prevailing opinions and sentiments of mankind? This law of conscience, therefore, in conformity to our author's *dictum*, ought to be opposite and contrary to the law of God. Elsewhere, we find the principle and the law of conscience characterized more consistently, in such terms as these:

"It is not God who is imposing laws, but men themselves, who, under the influence of their fleshly minds, are turning the Scriptures, which are spiritual, into mere codes of morals, intended for the regulation and restraint of the world.—Natural conscience, a mere faculty of the fleshly mind, is, it is true, getting enlightened on its own principles, through the medium of the Scriptures, understood as a divine law, or series of divine laws. But it is merely natural conscience which under such circumstances is enlightened. And the whole of its illumination, such as it is, consists in a complete perversion, on its part, of the meaning and object of God's word."—Pp. 475–477.

The third and final grand exhibition of human enmity commenced, we are told, at the destruction of Jerusalem; it is still in progress, and will continue till the end of time. It is the characteristic, we learn, of the dispensation of grace, that its benefits are strictly and in every sense of the word gratuitous. Law, we are told, has now passed away; the gospel is simply the publication of a fact revealed by God concerning himself and his intentions towards the human race, the knowledge of which,

as divine by man, is in him the earnest of life everlasting. This is a gift perfectly free and unconditional. But man, proud man, refuses to receive it on these terms, and must needs make it out that he has certain conditions to fulfil, in virtue of which he can make a claim to it in the light of wages for work done. This, at least, we conceive may possibly be the purport of our author's lengthened and somewhat vague and indefinite statements. If so, however, we contend that there are large and numerous parties against whom the charge is very unjustly brought. Certainly, we believe him who said, "They that have done good shall rise to the resurrection of life; they that have done evil, to the resurrection of condemnation." But this is because the cultivation of good habits and dispositions in this life is necessary to form that state of heart and mind which alone is fit or competent to taste the joys of a heavenly state. The nature of things, therefore, renders it necessary that the promise of future happiness should be made dependent upon this condition. And we allege that it is the *natural* tendency of the present state of things to furnish a mental and moral discipline which shall form such dispositions in our original human nature, training it by degrees to the knowledge, the love and the resemblance of its Maker. But we disclaim the idea of merit in the sight of God, if by this term be meant any intrinsic quality in good works which authorizes man to *demand* anything at the hand of his Maker. According to this view of it, we humbly conceive that the present life, considered as a preparatory state of existence for creatures destined for immortality, exhibits a more striking proof of the Divine wisdom and goodness, than if, with our author, we suppose it to have no efficacy imparted to it for the promotion of this great

and final object, and to be intended for no other purpose than to display in the clearest light the strange fact, that man, the creature of God, as the result of that human nature with which God had endowed him, is and must of necessity be in a state of utter and irreclaimable enmity to his Maker.

The penalty denounced against those enemies of God who persist in believing that the dead shall be judged according to their works, is nothing less, we are told, than the utter and everlasting destruction of that human nature, which is thus demonstrated to be in a state of entire and hopeless enmity, incapable of any amendment or change. Though the work of God, it should seem to have been a complete failure, and there is nothing to be done but to abandon it altogether as such. Let us not, however, be too much appalled by this alarming prospect. The system provides a way of escape. It pronounces a sentence of destruction upon *human nature*, not upon the individuals who bear this nature. They, it seems, are to be at once regenerated by taking up a new and divine nature.

"At the consummation of all things, Christ will be revealed in all the fulness of his glory as spiritual Adam; placing all human beings, as descendants of Adam and as actuated by a principle of enmity to God, in periods numbered by succession, or on his left hand; and placing *the same beings*, as descendants of and as new-created in himself and as actuated by the principle of love to God, in eternity proper, or on his right hand; punishing the *nature* of the former, or human nature, by swallowing it up eternally in the *nature* of the latter, or the divine nature. Here is at once the endurance of everlasting punishment and the enjoyment of everlasting life. Adam's nature is eternally punished, by being eternally destroyed; and yet, O wondrous love! the punishment is inflicted through the medium of conferring upon those whose creature nature is thus destroyed, the gift of life eternal. Thus is eternal punishment inflicted on human beings *as a whole*, through the medium of conferring upon them, as a whole, eternal life; and God thus

rewards men's enmity to himself by such a display of enmity to them in return, as consists, not in his returning evil for evil, as if he had been overcome by their evil, but in his giving them to live with himself forever, and thereby overcoming their evil with good."—Pp. 512-514.

We have thus endeavored to give a sort of outline of the leading features of this singular scheme, without attempting to enter into the variety of minuter details as they are exhibited at great length in the work before us. The author's style, though tolerably perspicuous, abounds of course with strange and revolting expressions, founded on his peculiar views. It is, besides, exceedingly prolix and diffuse, so that it would be difficult to compress an entire statement of his principles in his own words within any moderate compass. While expressing our own entire dissent from his doctrine, as inconsistent with what we think a rational interpretation of Scripture, we are not disposed to question that, like many others whose opinions appear to us both erroneous and of dangerous practical tendency, he may nevertheless have succeeded in so reconciling it in his own mind with sound views of Christian morality, as to enable him duly to present it to the minds and enforce it on the consciences of his hearers. We have no doubt that he contrives, in some way satisfactory to himself, to make even these principles the basis of practical instruction and exhortation; for, with all its extravagance, the book evidently proceeds from a pious, honest, and conscientious mind. It has been well said, that God has laid the foundation of virtue so deep in our hearts, that it is scarcely possible for any error in our heads to overturn it.

W. T.

[From the Christian Reformer — London, January, 1847.]

THE ALMANACS.

An Almanac used to be the appendage only of the bank, the counting-house, the chambers of the professional man, and the parlor of the substantial farmer. It is now found in every cottage. For a penny, a better Almanac can now be bought than half-a-crown would purchase when George IV. was king. This is one of the results of free-trade in Almanacs. Possibly, the capital now annually expended in this branch of the publishing trade may already, directly and indirectly, pay back to the revenue a sum equal to what it lost when it gave up the Almanac-tax.* Infinite are the combinations of the Almanac invented by modern ingenuity. "Punch" and the patent-medicine vender, the Jew slop-seller, and the Christian (Religious) Tract Society, half the Dissenting sects, and puffing tradesmen without end, now vie with Francis Moore, Physician, in publishing an Almanac. We have looked through a large pile of these annuals, and offer a line or two of criticism, and will cull one or two brief extracts. — The Company of Stationers evidently do not think, with Mr. Edward Baines, that the English people are a well-educated race, or they would not suppose it to be for their interest to put forth, in variegated page of red and black, astrological predictions and tables of the weather, specifying for each day rain or snow or heat, &c. The latter is given not only in the *Vox Stellarum*,

* In 1831, the Almanac-tax produced about £31,000. In that year duty was paid on the above 70 million pounds of paper. In 1845, duty was paid on upwards of 124 million pound d ing a revenue of £815,371.

but also in *Moore's Improved.* This professes to be for the farmer and the countryman. At p. 27, under the head, "Feeding of Calves," we find the instructive remark — "This consists in giving the animals abundance of milk, plenty of dry litter, and excluding the light." *Dry litter* and *excluding the light* seem to be a favorite prescription of the venerable "Physician," and are in his estimation as suitable for his biped as for his quadruped patients. The *Christian Almanac*, put forth by the Religious Tract Society, is a well-printed and on the whole commendable production. Each day in the year has its text of Scripture appended to the usual particulars of the Calendar. The juxta-position of fact and text is sometimes odd enough — as, for instance, "Camb. Lent. T. ends"—"Cease to do evil." Beneath "Cambridge and Oxford Michaelmas Term ends" — "God is angry with the wicked every day." To the birth-days of two of the Princesses, these texts are added—"Get understanding"—"Let thy words be few." A little below the birth-day of the King of Hanover, two texts are given that will suit different tastes — "He hath done all things well" —and, "I am a sinful man." The Bath District Visiting Society has put out an excellent penny Almanac, the alternate pages of which are filled with useful information and moral and economical hints. It will be a good "New Year's Gift" to Sunday scholars and poor neighbors. The *British Almanac* and its *Companion* sustain their high character for varied and accurate information. We are glad to see, under the head of Education, a list of the Professors of Manchester New College. Hereafter we hope to see a list of all the institutions and their Professors in connection with the University of London. The *Companion* opens with a very valuable paper on the Progress of Edu-

cation in England. By some remarkable tables, the writer shows the very small amount of service the endowed schools of the country have rendered in diffusing amongst the mass of the people common elementary instruction. Nine counties which have endowments for education exceeding the average by the gross sum of £83, or upwards of £9 per cent., in respect to the number of persons able to write, show an average deficiency of nearly 7 per cent. Again, eleven counties (chiefly in the North) in which the endowed schools fall below the average of the kingdom by nearly £8 per cent. each, exhibit a surplus of persons able to write of 8 per cent. He calculates that one-sixth of the entire population, or about three million children, ought to be under daily instruction. The number actually under instruction he calculates at 2½ millions — half a million of children, therefore, are still uneducated. But, for our own parts, we sadly fear that of the five-sixths who go to schools, not much above one-half receive what can be properly called *education.* The writer dwells strongly on the "insufficiency of the present system of education," but pays a high compliment to the recent voluntary efforts of societies and individuals by expressing the hope that Government will aim rather at aiding than superseding those efforts, and will in the first instance direct its plans towards providing a sufficiency of able and well-taught teachers. Of the other articles in the *Companion*, we can only speak of that which relates to "Government Offices." It is chiefly taken from Mr. Thomas's (of the Record Office) unpublished "Notes of Materials for the History of Public Departments," and contains some curious matter. Not less than 35 pages in small type are occupied with the description of 272 Railway Bills passed during the last session. Of

these, however, we believe less than a third were granted to new or independent companies. Still, the number, taken in connection with the capital empowered to be raised, is fearfully large. The "Necrological Table" records the departure during the year of twenty-eight men distinguished in literature and the arts. Of twenty-five the age is given, and shows an average of more than 68 years—a very remarkable circumstance.

The *Congregational Calendar* is a very cheap, and in some respects valuable annual. We observe with regret that this work, which comes out under the sanction of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, continues to give the wrong title to the Two Denominations of Independents and Baptists, falsely calling themselves the "General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the *Three* Denominations." According to a statement in the *Calendar*, the majority of the Presbyterian ministers of London, in 1836, "resolved to separate from the General Body, and so to dissolve the Three Denominations." (P. 36.) Common sense, as well as the practice of each of the Three Denominations, decides that the act of a majority is the act of the body. Are the Independents prepared to abide by the monstrous position, that the body of the Three Denominations is so "*essentially an orthodox Association*," (p. 35), that the "heterodoxy" of the majority of Presbyterians nullifies their proceedings, and converts the "orthodox" minority of *three* ministers of the Scotch Secession Kirk into the Presbyterian body? The orthodox portion of the Three Denominations, with equal truth and charity, acted on this strange assumption. But the Liberal Government of that day gave these gentlemen a very significant rebuke by admitting the English Presbyterians, in their separate capacity, to

the enjoyment of the privileges previously enjoyed by the united body. The *Calendar* gives a list of the *Evangelical* Presbyterian chapels and ministers in and near London, and we are amused with the industry with which this list is eked out. These three "rogues in buckram," aided by sundry "knaves in Kendal green," now number nineteen. It is amusing enough to see the marks put opposite to the names of these English Presbyterians; thus, first we have P. C., which means the "Presbyterian Church in England," elsewhere (p. 61) described as a "somewhat recent organization." It means in fact the *Scotch* Free Church adherents. Next we have, as a component part of the English Dissenters, S. K., the Scotch Kirk; then U. S., United Secession; and lastly, I. P., which it seems means "Independent Presbyterians," a denomination declined, we suppose, only in the *dual* number. Dr. A. Fletcher, of Finsbury chapel, (who denominationally must be regarded as "two single gentlemen rolled into one,") is the only representative of his fraction of the Evangelical Presbyterian body, and we suppose reports himself to himself as "accepted and approved." But, to be serious, our Independent brethren lower themselves, in a way which every friend of religion must regret, by these violations of truth and fair-dealing. They better become a board of sharp and unscrupulous railway directors, anxious to secure the monopoly of some profitable line, than grave divines, whose words should be those of truth and soberness.

The last, but not least welcome, is the *British and Irish Unitarian Almanac and Annual Register for the year* 1847. In addition to the information common to Almanacs, this new annual gives a list of Unitarian Congregations, with some judicious prefatory remarks explanatory of the principles on

which they are established; a list of Domestic Missions supported by Unitarians; of Unitarian Associations and Tract Societies; of Meetings of Ministers; and a brief account of Dr. Williams's Library and the Presbyterian Fund. It also contains a list of educational institutions which are free from tests; another, of the Unitarian Periodicals; and short articles on "the Christian Brethren," Foreign Unitarianism, on the present State and Prospects of Unitarianism, and a few pleasing poems. We hope this Almanac will be supported by the Unitarians of Great Britain. In future years it may be made in some respects more full. In the list of congregations it might be a convenience to Unitarian travellers to have them arranged in counties, and to give the hours of service. One or two changes have taken place since the list of congregations was made out: thus *Hinckley* and *Wareham* are now vacant, while at *Cheltenham* the Rev. W. Smith, at *Lancaster* the Rev. J. W. H. Hope, at *Macclesfield* the Rev. John Wright, B. A., at *Stand* the Rev. John Cropper, at *Torquay* the Rev. J. D. Casewell, are the officiating ministers. At York the Rev. G. Palmer is the assistant minister; and Mr. J. B. Davis, of Shelton, is, we believe, a layman. A list of the Fellowship Funds of England is wanted. Information respecting the Widows' Fund of London and of Lancashire and Cheshire—respecting the bursaries available for Unitarian students — the address in London of our ministers and the officers of our institutions — will be desirable additions in future Registers. We think the present publication an excellent beginning, notwithstanding some defects, and hope its Editor may be encouraged to continue and improve it. We cannot select a better specimen of the original matter contained in this Unitarian Almanac than a passage from the excel-

lent essay on the present state and prospects of Unitarianism. It relates to the outbreak of Anti-supernaturalism amongst us.

"The Anti-supernaturalist values the religion of Christ because he fancies he has a standard of truth and beauty within his own mind, to which the truths and precepts of the Gospel conform. The believer in Revelation bends his own notions to the instructions of Christ, who, in his opinion, has given sufficient proof of receiving immediate and peculiar divine communications, which are our highest authority respecting our duty here and our destiny hereafter. He reverently sits at the feet of Jesus, and desires to learn of him, adopting his moral views and heavenly hopes on account of their origin — not because he pretends to be capable of deciding on their abstract merits. We desire to rank with those who believe in and value a real revelation, and confidently trust to this belief becoming stronger for any temporary or apparent check — at the same time we desire to be understood to love truth better than any system, to advocate perfect freedom of thought, to trust only to the evidence in our favor, and to submit our most cherished opinions to the serious judgment of all who will make themselves competent to examine them — only condemning flippant ignorance, and being impatient of the artful confusion of opposite sentiments by fixing new meanings on words in order to steal into the hearts of those whom a more honest course might rouse to cautious examination."—Pp. 53, 54.

WHY THEOLOGIANS DISPARAGE REASON.

Shrewd men do not substitute any thing in the place of reason, so long as reason will serve them. It is when the eye of the spectator must not be too long prying, that the conjuror envelops himself in smoke. Some men play the conjuror consciously, some unconsciously. — *Christian Reformer. Jan.* 1847.

INTELLIGENCE.

"SPIRITUAL STATISTICS," DERIVED FROM THE CONGREGATIONAL CALENDAR FOR 1847.

In London and the suburbs there are 133 Independent chapels. The Congregational Board of London numbers 139 members. There are also 74 Baptist chapels. The Board of Baptist ministers numbers 52. The Baptist churches in the United Kingdom amount to 1872, being an increase over the previous year of 85. Only 773 churches have made returns. These show a nett increase of 3063 members for the year 1845—nearly four members to each church. But it is stated and deplored by the Baptist Union, that the increase is less than any during the past ten years, and that the annual average rate of clear increase has for the last five years been constantly on the decline, that 200 churches report no increase, and 150 of them indicate a decrease amounting to 1250 members.

At the Wesleyan Annual Conference (the 103rd) held at Bristol, July 29th, the total number of members throughout the world was set down as 469,064, being an increase in the year of 751. In Great Britain and Ireland, the members are 369,014, being an increase of only 310. The churches have increased in Great Britain, Asia, Australia, Southern and Western Africa, St. Vincent and Demerara, Western Canada, New Brunswick and Hudson's Bay. They have decreased in Ireland, Europe, Antigua, Jamaica, Eastern Canada, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. There are in America 1744 stated preachers; the lists of local preachers are not given.

The income for missions was £112,823, being an increase over 1844 of £7136.

The Wesleyan Methodist Association has 615 members less than last year, having now 20,561 members in society. There are 1077 local preachers, and 95 itinerant preachers, 313 chapels, 248 preaching places, and 320 Sunday schools, numbering 41,026 scholars.

The Primitive Methodists have 87,986 members, and 72,497 Sunday scholars. There are six Presbyterians in England connected with the Free Church, having 77 churches in one General Synod. The "English Presbyterian College" is held at Exeter Hall, and has 18 students.

The Free Church of Scotland has 823 congregations, 70 Presbyteries and 17 Synods. 625 churches have been already built, at an average cost of £660. 100 additional churches are projected. The sum raised for the purposes of the Free Church during the year, amounted to £300,276.

The Seventh Report of the Registrar-General, gives a total of 2467 places of worship registered for marriages. The Presbyterians have 195, the Independents 970, and the Baptists 599. In the year ending Dec. 31, 1844, there were 12,240 marriages under the New Act, being about one-tenth of the number celebrated by the Church of England. In 1845, the Baptists built 20 chapels, and enlarged 6. The Independents built 24, and enlarged 9.

DR. VAUGHAN ON GEOLOGY AND THE BIBLE.

At the annual meeting of the Manchester Geological Society, the following beautiful address was delivered by the Rev. Robert Vaughan, LL. D., Principal of the Lancashire Independent College,

on his health being given by the Chairman, James Heywood, Esq., F. R. S. We are indebted for this excellent report to the *Manchester Guardian.*

"It is no more than we are accustomed to expect from science, that it should have disposed men to cultivate what are termed the courtesies of life; for science ought to give refinement, and to awaken in man a new feeling in the intelligent intercourse he may hold with his fellow-men. I feel that I owe my place with you to-day to the feeling which science has generated. It has brought me into the midst of a company of gentlemen to whom I am unknown; but I am here purely upon the assumption that the subjects which are interesting to your party are not uninteresting to me; and that though hitherto unknown to each other, here we may meet and recognize a tie of brotherhood. (Applause.) With respect to the science of geology, in common perhaps with some others, in particular connection with whom I stand, there have been seasons in my history when I was disposed to look upon it with considerable misgivings. I am free, however, to confess, and indeed very happy to confess, that the longer I live, the more I feel interested in it, because of what it is, and because of what it tends to. Even in the little smattering of knowledge I possess in respect to it, I must confess that I have found new sources of interest opened to me, in the contemplation of nature, of which I was before unconscious, and that even the very stone that I see a man breaking on the road, to give a pass to cart-wheels, has a something of poetry in it when looked at geologically—(hear),—a look of vast antiquity, that element of the sublime inseparable from the thought of long duration; for it is older than the present generation; older than the present race, or probably than all the past races on our globe.

(Hear.) There is a vastness of antiquity in that very pebble, that gives to it an interest which otherwise it could not possess. And I know of nothing more sublime, than to stand on the summit of some lofty mountain, and be able to trace there the effects generated by the mighty flood, as it made its way from the forces of nature up to that summit, and again ran down the sides of that mountain; and to conceive all the mighty masses of strata heaving below the forces once in action there. I have thought of all these things till I could have wished to have been like a spirit floating in air, and looking down on those tremendous convulsions of nature, which have been one of the sublimest spectacles that the human eye could ever rest upon. And by geology we can trace the progress of these things; we can make out the history of those enormous masses of that long past time. Then when I look at geology, and give full credit, as I do, to the report which the geologists make of the remote dates of these strata and this granite, I take my stand at this point, from which I date the commencement of man's existence, and instead of having reached a point beyond which every thing is blank, I reach only the threshold, upon which to look out upon the mighty changes that have been evolving for myriads of years before. (Hear.) There is to me a poetry and a grandeur in the works of Deity, when I look upon them as stretching out after this manner, and measuring spaces of time upon a scale so wonderful. And then all this seems to me to be perfectly in harmony with what we knew from other sources relative to that great nature with whose presence and agency we associate all these things. Of that nature we may say, that being the nature that has eternity at its disposal, it can afford to be slow. It is for mortals to

hurry; it is for the creatures of a day to be in haste; it is for the Eternal to move on with the slowness which we see in connection with the mighty processes that belong to the history of the material globe on which we tread. (Applause.) Every thing about his works partakes of a character that seems to bespeak majesty, — the majesty of slowness; the absence of haste and hurry. How slow and imperceptible is the breaking of the day, or the setting of the sun; how beautifully do the spring and autumn, the winter and summer, come and go! They are never stationary, and yet they never seem to be in movement. They blend slowly, beautifully, statelily, majestically, together. Every thing about us is to me more or less impressed with an idea of this kind. When we attempt to conceive, to form an idea at all, of what is meant by an eternity past, how must that eternity have been occupied? Can that Being whom we suppose to have given existence to later time, or in connection with this period, to all that we see exist, — has He been unemployed before? If his nature is unchangeable, he must (we conceive) for ever have been employed much as now; and all that exists as worlds and systems now, is only a link in the mighty chain of being that has been revolving and revolving through an eternity that is past, and that will revolve and revolve to an infinity to come. (Applause.) I look at geology as standing in beautiful relation with these ideas of the Creator and Governor of the universe; and I see nothing in that Book which I revere as a commandment and a revelation from Heaven, that is not in perfect harmony with all the great facts which we conceive to to have been settled by the science of geology. (Applause.) I fear nothing for the religion of the Bible from the progress of science. The great mir

chief that has come to that religion, has been from the absence of science, and not from the presence of it. (Hear.) I believe that if we are now free men, if now we are taken out of the hands of the priesthood, if our minds are no longer scared with the frightful superstitions that come down with so much terror upon the spirits of men in a past time, it is because science has gone with her torch into the cell and convent of the monks of old, and has sent her light upon all the cheats and frauds practised there, and has proclaimed liberty to the spirit of man. That has been the effect of science; that will be the effect of science. Whatever may be the oppression and suffering to which the spirit of man upon any wide scale may be subjected in future, the present position of science will always put down the miraculous pretensions of contemporary beings, so as to prevent the return of any thing like that tyranny over the spirit and conscience which has been exercised to so large an extent in the history of our species. (Applause.) I feel interested in every thing belonging to the progress of science on this account; confident as I am, that while it is very possible for you to outstrip the science of the Bible, because the natural science of the Bible is, as it ought to have been, the natural science of the times when the Bible was written—(hear)—you may outstrip that; but as to the sublime moral purposes of that book, in respect of them you will halt unto the end. They will always be in advance of every attainment that man may make in rightness of thinking, of feeling, and of action; and as long as the Bible holds that high advanced moral position, I care not about its being regarded as an encyclopædia of science. (Applause.)"

THE POPE.

Pius IX. has just put forth a Latin Epistle, addressed to all the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops and Bishops of the Catholic Church. Whatever other effect this Encyclical Letter may have, it will assuredly allay the apprehensions of zealous members of the Church of Rome respecting the reported liberalism of his Holiness. It breathes throughout the wonted spirit of the Vatican. The opponents of his Church are, in the estimation of Pius IX., "haters of the truth and of the light, and most skilful artificers of fraud;" they "labor to quench in the minds of all men every aspiration after piety, justice and honesty;" they "corrupt morals, confound all rights, human and divine;" they "rend asunder, undermine — nay, if such a thing were possible, overturn from their foundations, both the Catholic religion and civil society." The madness and guilt of those who trust to private judgment rather than to the authorized Church in the interpretation of Scripture, and of those who set their reason above faith, are denounced. Other objects of the Papal denunciation are secret sects (clandestinæ sectæ), and the Bible Society. The passage in which these are mentioned is extraordinary. "And now, Venerable Fathers, ye well know the other monstrous errors and frauds by which the men of the present age virulently attempt to overthrow the Catholic religion, and the divine authority of the Church and its laws, and to trample in the dust the institutions of both the divine and civil power. To this object are directed the wicked attacks on the Roman Chair of the most blessed Peter, in which Christ hath placed the immovable foundation

of his Church. * * * This is the aim of those most crafty Bible Societies, which, renewing the old trick of heretics, are perpetually putting forth the books of the Holy Scriptures, translated in defiance of the most sacred rules of the church, into the several vulgar tongues, and often explained by the most perverse interpretations; — these translations they gratuitously circulate at a great expense, and by means of a vast number of copies, amongst the more ignorant men of every class. Rejecting divine Tradition, the doctrine of the Fathers, and the authority of the Catholic Church, each interprets the Word of God by his own private judgment, perverts its meaning, and thus falls into the greatest errors. Gregory XVI., whose unworthy successor we are, emulating the examples of his predecessors, condemned by his Apostolic Letters these Societies, and we in like manner desire to condemn them."—The other evils against which his Holiness warns his Bishops and Clergy are, religious indifferentism,—the conspiracy into which even priests have been seduced against clerical celibacy,—and "those perverse methods of philosophical and other instructions which miserably deceive and corrupt heedless youth, and give them to drink the dragon's gall in the cup of Babylon (*fel draconis in calice Babylonis propinat*),—the doctrines of Communism, —and the horrible pestilence of books and pamphlets every where flying about, which teach men to sin, scatter abroad pestilential doctrines," &c. &c. Finally, the Bishops are to warn and exhort their people to shun the sects and societies of the wicked, and all things which are hostile to faith, religion, and purity of morals.

RELIGIOUS ELECTIONEERING.

We learn from the newspapers, that Mr. J. B. Smith, of Manchester, is a candidate for Parliament, in consequence of an invitation unanimously given him at a public meeting of the electors of the Stirling burghs. A London Church Evangelical journal, the *Record*, has thought proper to denounce Mr. Smith in its columns as an unfit candidate, because "he is known as an avowed Unitarian, i. e. a Socinian." This intolerant newspaper was following its vocation in this violation of Christian charity; but our readers will be surprised to learn, that two gentlemen, professing the same liberal politics as Mr. Smith, have come forward to oppose him, by appealing to the *odium theologicum* of the electors. The *Manchester Times* states, that

"Captain Spiers, one of the candidates, in his address, after stating that 'it has been the custom for candidates to express their opinions on religious subjects,' forthwith advertises himself as 'a Presbyterian.' Mr. Alison, the other candidate, omitted the mention of a religious qualification in his address, but it appears that, 'whilst making *public* professions of the doctrines of religious tolerance and political equality, he privately goes from dwelling to dwelling amongst the electors, asserting that his rival is not a Christian, and claiming superiority for himself on account of his religious professions.' To the credit of the Scottish press, not one of the journals of either political party have aided Capt. Spiers or Mr. Alison in their disreputable attempts at trading in the religious prejudices of the electors whose support they seek."

The same newspaper (the editor of which is a Scottish Presbyterian) adds,

"We have known Mr. Smith upwards of twenty-five years, and no man in our community bears a higher character for honor and integrity, and we believe that even those opposed to him in religion or politics, to whom he is known, will do justice to him in this respect. Mr. Smith belongs to the same religious denomination as our respected member, Mr. Mark Phillips, and we trust that the electors of the Stirling burghs will treat with the like contempt the persecutors of Mr. Smith on account of his religion, as such would be treated in Manchester, were they to attempt to infringe upon the religious liberty of Mr. Phillips."

Of a different and more gratifying character is the following scene, which occurred at a meeting at Manchester of Mr. John Bright's election committee. In order to understand the significancy of the narrative, which we take from the *Manchester Guardian*, it should be remembered, that in no place in the kingdom did the "orthodox" Dissenters offer a more dogged resistance to the Chapels' Bill than in Manchester, and that leading men of the Congregational denomination declared that no man should receive their votes who voted for "the unrighteous Bill." But a better spirit has come over them; and Mr. John Bright, to whose declaration we now invite the attention of our readers, is the pet candidate of Mr. George Hadfield and the Manchester Independents.

"Mr. James Wooley wished to ask one question, in order that the answer might be made as public as possible, as he was aware that it might have the effect of deciding the votes of many electors. He was called upon last night by two gentlemen, with a request to sign the requisition to Lord Lincoln; and one of them stated, in order to influence his

decision, that Mr. Bright had stated he was sorry he had voted with Sir Robert Peel for the Dissenters' Chapels Bill. He wished to ask Mr. Bright if he did regret his vote on that occasion? because it would have some effect on a large body of electors."

"Mr. Bright: The question is put, whether I repented of having voted in favor of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill? I have heard such a statement from another source; and I believe it arises entirely from a mistake. I never myself for a moment felt disposed to doubt of the propriety of voting for that Bill. (Hear, hear.) And on the evening when it was discussed, the late Sir William Follett, then Attorney-General, made one of the most beautiful and powerful speeches I ever heard in favor of any bill or any measure. I listened to it with great satisfaction, and felt only the more confirmed by what he said of the propriety of the vote I intended to give. And I further understood that Sir Thomas Wilde, the present Chief Justice, was to have arisen and have answered Sir W. Follett, and to have spoken against the Bill. However, he did not come forward, and the whole argument appeared to lie with the Attorney-General and those who were in favor of the Bill. I voted for it, have never regretted it, and, knowing and understanding, as I then knew and understood it, if it were to be brought in next session of Parliament, I should vote as I did then. ('Hear,' and applause.)"

EXTRACT.

ALEXANDRIA.

On landing at the quay of Alexandria, strangers are at first struck with the movement and bustle prevailing. Everything seems to denote a flourishing commerce and an active administration; sounds of activity are heard on all sides, especially in the arsenal; the custom-house is thronged with people, and crowded with merchandise. As you advance into the town, it assumes the aspect of a decayed Italian city, until you reach the great square, where very fine buildings are to be seen. The Turkish quarter is also full of good houses. But in the neighborhood of all this, under the very walls of the palace, are huts which make one blush to think that human beings can be compelled to dwell therein; even in the streets of this sea-port town you will perceive evidence of squalor and misery — the Arabs that crowd them are dirty and half-clad. In the suburbs and immediate neighborhood, the most abject poverty is manifest. We have seen, within the city walls, tall girls, of ten or twelve years old, walking about without a rag of covering, as naked as they were born. On the banks of the Nile, half the population seem scarcely to have any clothing. The common food of the people is a coarse kind of bread, or beans, or lentils; their drink is water, and, on rare occasions, coffee; their wants are extremely few, and they would not be dissatisfied with their condition if they were allowed to remain in their villages, and run the ordinary chances of life. Forced labor, however, and the conscription in time of war, render them completely unsettled; and the necessity of paying an

exorbitant capitation-tax weighs upon their spirits. Some represent the Arabs as, on the whole, a very cheerful race; they do not appear so to us. They have moments of forced gaiety, certainly; and, when under the influence of the intoxicating *hasheesh*, or in the hands of a story-teller, or wasting their earnings of a month in the festivities of a marriage or a circumcision, they laugh like hyenas; but, generally, their look is sullen and downcast.—*Topic.*

[From the London Inquirer, No. 232.]

CONSOLATION.

. . . . . In the still night,
A sad and solemn dream passed heavily
Before me, and my sleeping eyes were fixed
On One far distant from their waking gaze;
One that my soul had loved,—as others said,
Well, but not wisely—but I knew 't was well.—
Sadness was on her forehead; tears unshed
Filled up their fountains and oppressed her eyes;
Methought she often wept in solitude,
When none beheld her, and none comforted.
The clouds of heaven, that once, in other days,
Were images of beauty to her soul,
Went on unnoticed now:—green leaves and flowers
No longer cheered her with their hues of joy.
The ocean sparkled at her feet, but sent
No sunbeam to her bosom; for the shade
Of melancholy thoughts hung over her,
Veiling the brightness of the universe.
Her grief was silent, and its cause unknown,
But at the picture of those sorrowing eyes
That once had been like light ineffable
To mine, my spirit sank in fear, and bowed
In deep affliction. There was a gulf between;—
I could not speak to her; and yet I knew
That she was sad.

* * * * *

My prayer ascended to th' eternal throne,
And from the gates of heaven an angel, like
The day-star in his solemn countenance,
Came down, and stood beside me as I prayed.

* * * * *

"Child of the earth, lift up
Thy voice, and to the winds and mountain echoes
Commit the words of Consolation. Say
That far away, unseen, but not forgetting,
Is one who feels her sorrow as his own,
And yearns to comfort her; one who has mourned
In solitude, and wept alone, and has
Himself been comforted.
If some strange grief upon her path has fallen,
Quenching the light of her accustomed pleasures,
Blighting some hope, some golden dream dispelling;
Or if some idol of the heart, that long
Was worshipped as a household deity,
Be snatched away; or, harder still, if none
Be near to sympathise — to feel the grief
She feels, and weep when she is weeping — then
Oh, speak in gentlest accents to the soul
O'erladen, and those blessed words repeat,
'Whom the Lord *loves*, He chastens.'
"Tell her that
Our sorrows are our guardian angels, sent
To minister eternal happiness.
Tell her there hangs upon the wings of Time
An everlasting balm: — bid her look on
From the dull midnight to the coming day,
When light shall be restored, nor ever doubt
That, in the fulness of th' appointed hour,
The day will rise.
And gently chide her if the gloom remain
Too long upon her soul: — say that the hand
Of Mercy gave; and if it takes again
Part of its gift of joy, that self-same hand
Still gives abundantly, unnumbered blessings,
And lasting sorrow is ingratitude.
Yet speak it tenderly, for grief is hard
To bear. —
And last, but chiefest too, oh, speak of Heaven.
Speak gloriously: — point to the opening grave
And then to the resplendent skies, and say
Death is no Enemy, and Heaven no dream,
And Life is leading through the paths of sorrow
To peace beyond.
"Child of the earth, lift up
Thy voice: — it may be that some friendly breeze
By Heaven ordained, shall waft it to the soul,
Seeking for Consolation.'

* * * * *

I spake, and to the winds and mountain echoes
Poured forth the language of my heart; but ere
The angel had ascended, my sad vision
Melted away.

October, 1846.

THE

UNITARIAN.

[From the Inquirer, No. 235—London, January 2, 1847.]

I SEEK AFTER TRUTH, BY WHICH NO MAN EVER YET WAS INJURED.
M. Antoninus.

ONE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIX—A RETROSPECT.

ANOTHER year now belongs to history. Its course is finished, and its events are enrolled in the annals of the past, as lessons respecting the designs of Providence, and the connection and results of human actions, and as examples and warnings to generations yet unborn. We are too near to these events, and have ourselves had too much part in them, to be impartial judges of their character and tendency; yet it is not unwise in us to look back, from the position we have now gained, upon the scenes through which we have recently passed, and endeavor, as far as possible, to arrive at a proper estimate of public measures immediately affecting our country, or our fellow-creatures in general; and of the prospects, external, intellectual, and religious, which our present situation opens to us. We begin with a few words on Political Events.

The commencement of the last year found us engaged in an eager and anxious, although then hopeful struggle against the system of taxing the people's bread; and that not even for the sake of public revenue, but in order to afford the advantage of monopoly prices to the one class in the community which is immediately interested, or supposes itself to be so, in keeping up the price of the produce of the soil. That struggle has terminated triumphantly. On the 26th of June last, the Royal Assent was given to a Bill immediately reducing the scale of duties on Corn, and entirely abolishing them at the close of three years; thus recognizing the principle of the Anti-Corn League — the principle of the justice and necessity of a free trade in the most essential article of human subsistence, and, consequently, in all other articles which become objects of human desire. The continuance of a modified duty for three years was a compromise, which was resisted by the free-traders in the belief that an immediate and final settlement of the question was most desirable for the interests of all, and that the progress of events might very probably manifest, in some way, the great inconvenience of imperfect measures. On this point there would probably now be little difference of opinion. A feeling of obligation in honor to those in whose favor the compromise was made, has prevented the present Government from throwing open the ports, when circumstances loudly demanded it; and the consequence has, no doubt, been a considerable aggravation of the evils of scarcity. Imperfect, however, as the measure has been, it has already proved a great boon, and its permanent effects promise to be far more important than those hitherto experienced. We cannot affect to entertain the smallest doubt of the justice and expediency

for ourselves, and for all our brethren of the human race, of free-trade principles being fully and fearlessly applied; and as we consider that the battle of argument has been fought and won, and a large preponderance of intelligent public opinion permanently secured, we conclude that only financial considerations — which on a proper system need not stand in the way — will delay their full application, and that duties will henceforth be considered in reference to revenue only, without any attempt or desire to force trade into particular channels. For this great change the year 1846 will be memorable throughout future time, though we must expect that our wiser successors will only wonder at the obstinacy which prevented the question being earlier settled, and will be more disposed to condemn us for not having sooner acted a just and reasonable part, than to render due honor to the perseverance, energy, and intelligence, which overcame such obstacles as we have learned by experience how to estimate, and won their way to a sure though long-deferred triumph. The time may well come, and may not even be very distant, when that mighty and glorious association, the Anti-Corn-Law League, will only obtain due honor by the fidelity with which the history of its progress will be preserved, from a race who will scarcely be able to realize to their minds that monopolist fallacies could have been supported as they were, or that interest and prejudice could give such strength, as they did, to a mere cobweb tissue.

The past year has been remarkable for some other legislative enactments besides that to which we have referred, which, though not establishing any great contested principle, are interesting as marking the progress of improvement. With especial pleasure we noticed a Bill, which swept away,

stroke, a mass of absurdity and injustice respecting Roman Catholics and Jews, and made considerable advances at least towards placing them, in every respect, on that footing of equality with all their fellow-citizens to which they are fully entitled. Nor should we entirely pass in silence the formal abolition of the antiquated folly of deodands; it is one step forward, and is not without its use. More serious matter for congratulation may be found in the Bill for promoting Baths and Wash-houses, which indicates a wise attention to the health and comfort of the mass of society, and a determination to use the power of civilization in affording cheap advantages which cannot be too highly prized. It would be an easy task to blame what was not done, or was done imperfectly; but we are ready to take for granted, with respect to every desirable change, that it is coming. We are sure at least that it is only a question of time; and whilst we labor to promote whatever we deem good, we look on all that is gained with satisfaction — on all that remains to be contended for with good hope, and a pleasing certainty that well-meant exertions will not be wasted.

From national affairs we pass to the great interests of humanity and Christian morality.

The past year has seen great efforts made in the cause of permanent and universal peace. The advocates of this principle no longer feel it to be necessary to contend against wars of conquest and ambition, in denouncing which all the better part of mankind are already prepared to join them. They are able to come to the point of the consistency of even defensive war with the precepts of Christ, and with the acknowledged principles of justice and benevolence; and to show how war may be superseded by a tribunal for deciding the

differences of nations, and substituting an equitable award for the chance of victory. We believe there can be no question that the spirit of peace is advancing rapidly in society, and that social unions to diffuse it are obtaining such attention and success as greatly to encourage those who approve of them, to perseverance in their labors.

We cannot leave this subject without referring to the proceedings of ELIHU BURRITT. This gentleman, having risen into notice by his extraordinary genius for the acquisition of languages, and having deserved and acquired considerable literary reputation, has thrown himself with great enthusiasm into the peace movement; and during a visit to Europe, which the state of his health rendered desirable, he is devoting his extraordinary energies almost entirely to the beneficent purpose of establishing a League of Universal Brotherhood. He does not appear to be an effective speaker at public meetings, but his written style is original and striking, and his benevolent enthusiasm is highly interesting. There can be no doubt of his having produced a considerable effect in bringing many to feel the wickedness and folly of war, and openly to protest against it, who had previously been indifferent, or had yielded to a fancied necessity. We cordially wish success to the League of Universal Brotherhood. It is in the right spirit, and we rejoice to think that many in different countries are ready for it. May it so prosper that its establishment shall hereafter be accounted one of the distinctions of 1846.

Another philanthropic agitation, which has been actively carried forward during the past year, and which naturally associates itself with opposition to man destroying his brother-man by war, is that against death-punishment. In early and rude times

death was freely and almost carelessly inflicted as a penalty for offences. Very slowly, men have acquired better notions of the nature and objects of punishment, and juster views of the extent of their own authority over their fellows. At length the conviction is becoming general, that death-punishment totally fails in effecting its professed object — the prevention of crime; that the risk of its infliction on the innocent is horrible; and that its exhibition has a hardening and depraving influence. Whilst many deny altogether the right to take away from a fellow-mortal the mysterious gift of life, and many are beginning to perceive that the punishment which is not reformatory cannot be truly exemplary, — and that the real business of public punishment is to restore, not to avenge or to terrify, — 1846 deserves to be commemorated for the advancement of just views on this important subject; but the friends of humanity must redouble their exertions.

We pass to the question of Slavery.

In the earlier stages of society, the institution of slavery was the means of preventing wholesale murder; and, in a rude state, its evils were far less than they become as civilization advances. The time has been when men, having many honorable and virtuous sentiments, and many kind feelings, could consider a border raid or a descent from the Highlands, to plunder the inhabitants of the plains, as justifiable undertakings; could account the thirst for conquest glorious, and regard those born in an inferior condition as destined by nature to submit to their caprices and impositions. The progress of knowledge and of the influences of religion has nearly done away with such things amongst the more civilized nations. Slavery has, in like manner, been destroyed before European

civilization. We *know*, and he cannot be found who dares to pretend a doubt, that every man is by nature free, — that no social laws can justifiably affect a man's natural right, except as a punishment for injury to others, — that property in a fellow-creature cannot possibly exist, and cannot be claimed or held without crime. We have no credit in avowing these principles. With our opportunities, and with no powerful selfish interests perverting our minds, it would be strange if we could think otherwise. But we are not permitted to be content with feeling rightly ourselves; we must endeavor to spread all good influences around us, and to redress the wrongs of our brethren, to whatever extent it can possibly be done, without resort to unworthy means. Even amongst nations low in civilization, we may do much towards mitigating the horrors of slavery, and hastening its abolition; but when civilized and free States, entitled otherwise to be considered as our equals, uphold and sanction it, we are especially bound to use our moral influence to the utmost in endeavoring to conquer so enormous an evil. Slavery has never existed in the world in a more odious form; it has never in any other case been accompanied with such revolting and disgraceful circumstances as in those of the United States of America, whose constitutions unhappily recognize this barbarous institution. The world has too long looked on in silence at this great abomination; and to abstain longer from using all means of influence which are in themselves allowable, is nothing less than to become partakers in a crime which is a reproach to human nature. There is no kind of violation of law, of morality, or of Christian charity, for which, when we really consider the circumstances, we do not find some palliation in the ignorance or pre-

judices of the individual, or in the force of the temptation to which he was exposed. We should be always merciful to individuals, endeavoring to enlighten and reform them, not to avenge upon them the crimes they have committed; but our mercy must not go to the extent of excusing the crime, or allowing it for a moment to appear respectable. It may seem hard to require men to give up what they hold with the sanction of law, and what they see bearing a pecuniary value all around them: but it matters not; they hold what they have no right to, — what they well know in their hearts that they can have no right to, — what it is a manifest receiving of stolen goods to be in possession of, — nay more, what they cannot hold without a constant use of force intervening between a brother-man and the freedom which God has given him, — which constitutes them *man-stealers*, and makes them deserve all the odium belonging to this appellation. It is the business and duty of every man, not himself involved in the guilt, to make them feel that they are daily committing crime, and that they are criminals in the eye of the world; that all their good institutions are disgraced and contaminated by this foul blot, and that they can obtain no respect until they have wiped it away; that until then, their talk about religion and liberty all passes for hypocrisy, and only seems to aggravate their guilt.

The year 1846 has given birth to the Anti-Slavery League, an honest and plain-spoken protest against the wickedness of Slavery, in which the voices of multitudes are combined, and which we trust will not long utter in vain its soul-stirring remonstrances. For this we are indebted to the visit to this country of William Lloyd Garrison, a man much abused, because entirely without the

spirit of compromise, and making little account of differences of opinions on other subjects, amongst those who will unite, in the spirit of the Gospel, to overcome the evils which afflict humanity, and, in the first place, to put down the crime and misery of Slavery, — but, nevertheless, a man of noble simplicity, earnestness, and power of mind, a true Christian philanthropist, and one as naturally loved as he is deservedly honored by those who can understand his character.

The existing Anti-Slavery Society no longer satisfies the wants of the age. Whilst it sanctions the vain effort to stop the slave-trade by the use of violence, contrary to the principles on other occasions avowed by many of its members, and persevered to the last in demanding that the West Indian sugar monopoly should be upheld, from a scruple of receiving slave-grown sugar, notwithstanding the immense injury thus inflicted on the people of England, and the acknowledged facts that other slave-grown produce cannot be excluded, and that slave-grown sugar was consumed by our own colonists, to enable them to send all their own produce, to be sold to us at the enhanced monopoly price, — whilst they were thus chargeable with very serious mistakes in their own mode of pursuing their object, they have shrunk from the full application of moral force, and have not only abstained from joining, but have severely censured, those who have taken the true ground, which the progress of public sentiment now justifies us in occupying, — that holding fellow-men in slavery is in all cases a crime, and that those who are guilty of it must in all cases be treated as criminals; and those who sanction them, by treating them as if they did no wrong, must be regarded as companions and encouragers of thieves. No man can be a practical Christian, or can be recognized

as one who desires to follow JESUS as his disciple, who calls himself the owner of his brother; and none can aid in the extinction of slavery, who do not begin with the recognition of these principles. It was therefore necessary, if progress is now to be made, that some new Association should be organized, and the visit of Mr. GARRISON to England joined with other circumstances in suggesting the time and manner.

1846 was likewise distinguished by a World's Temperance Convention, and by great and various efforts, not altogether without manifest effect, and which doubtless were more important in the way of preparation, to check the wide-spread evil of intemperance. May this cause, too, advance. But we have exhausted our space, whilst we have yet many things to speak of, and we must hasten onward. Among the efforts of philanthropy, one thing more must claim a passing word. We must just refer to the important progress of the Early-Closing Movement, which we are happy to see obtaining constantly-increasing attention, and making such advances in the estimation of both the employers and the public, that we can now calculate with confidence on the effect of well-sustained exertions. Unwillingly, too, we abstain from more particular reference to the awakened attention now manifest in respect to Sanatory Reform, which is one of the sure signs of social progress; but we have not, in other ways, neglected that important subject.

We pass to a melancholy distinction of the year that is closed. It has been, by the ordinance of that Providence which arranges in wisdom the alternations of human condition, a year of general scarcity, and, consequently, in the poorest countries, of actual famine. We need not dwell here on horrors which it has too often been our duty to detail.

Bad as things actually are, it is a relief to consider how much civilization and humanity are alleviating the evil, and what efforts are made both to obtain supplies for the present, and to provide against the recurrence of a like calamity. These events seem designed as lessons, both to nations and to individuals; and we hope they will be so improved, that with the remembrance of Ireland's miseries, during this appalling winter, may be associated, in future times, her rapid improvement, as consequent on endeavors to remove her grievances, and develop her resources, which this sad season has called forth.

Let what is hopeful and what is depressing in our condition equally urge us onward. Let us enter on the new year, each determined, individually and socially, to make it a year of progress. Each resolved, personally, to perform our duty faithfully, and advance in knowledge and in virtue, correcting the faults of the past, and laying up happy recollections against the time when 1847 shall also be numbered with the years departed, and all of us, as members of society, laboring in the cause of truth and knowledge, of moral and political improvement, and of a benevolence, to which neither language, nor race, nor color, places any boundary — which endeavors to bless the whole race of man.

[From the Inquirer, No. 239—London, February, 1847.]

BRITISH ANTI-STATE CHURCH ASSOCIATION — SOIREE AT MANCHESTER.

A *soirée* to promote the objects of this association was held on Thursday week in the Corn Exchange, when, notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather, snow having been falling for the previous thirty hours, there was a large and respectable attendance.

Tea and coffee were in the first place taken by the company, and the number of ladies and gentlemen who sat down to the well-furnished tables was about 700. Among the ministers and gentlemen present were — the Rev. Dr. Price (Editor of the *Eclectic Review*), Mr. Edward Miall (Editor of the *Nonconformist*), Rev. W. Patterson, Rev. Dr. Massie, Rev. Dr. Howarth, Rev. T. G. Lee, Rev. Richard Jones, Rev. T. Hughes, Rev. A. E. Pearce, &c., George Hatfield, Esq., William Burd, jun. Esq., J. Rylands, Esq., John Brooks, Esq., Samuel Giles, Esq., P. Thomson, Esq., A. Prentice, Esq., William Morris, Esq., W. A. Cunningham, Esq., Josiah Barker, Esq., Joseph Spencer, Esq., J. A. Cheetham, Esq., William Shuttleworth, Esq., John Kirkham, Esq., and other influential gentlemen.

James Watts, Esq. presided on the occasion.

The first resolution was moved by the Rev. W. Patterson, who made an admirable speech. He had been asked what he, as a professing Christian and a Christian minister, had to do with politics? Now, he did not come there as a Christian minister to interfere with politics; but he stood there, as far as politics were concerned, as an Englishman, and

claimed the right to use the power and influence which the constitution gave him, to do whatever he believed would promote the welfare of the country — (cheers). He was not one of those who held, that in professing Christianity, and taking up the office of a Christian minister, he thereby abandoned all his civil rights, and had nothing to do but to preach the Gospel. For individuals to find fault with him and others for taking part in a movement which might in any way be associated with politics, certainly came with an ill-grace from those whose bishops took part in making the civil laws of the country. If, with regard to the great and important object in view, he, as a Christian minister, had anything to do with politics, it was simply because the course of legislation in this country had plunged him into that connection; and he now came forward with the view of endeavoring to burst the bonds and sever the ties which united religion and politics, to draw religion entirely from its connection with the state, and to leave Christianity to do its own important work — (cheers). After confuting the accusation that the Association was endeavoring to pull down the church of Christ, he remarked that it was sometimes said that a Christian Government was bound to support a Christian Church; but this plea would not avail our rulers; for they supported Episcopacy in England, Presbyterians in Scotland, Roman Catholicism in Canada, Wesleyanism, he believed, in some parts of the empire; Presbyterianism and Unitarianism in Ireland; the worship of Juggernaut in India; and Paganism in other countries. If our Sovereign was the head of the church, what a strange medley was the church of which she was the head, composed as it was of this incongruous assemblage of creeds! — (great cheering). He contended that they had no

right to support or pull down any of those churches. All that they had to do was, to see that they were not compelled to support those churches — (applause), to see that no man was called upon to subscribe a single farthing to the religion of which his conscience did not approve. Let every church stand or fall on its own merits, and do its own work.

[The resolutions may be found in the columns of the Inquirer].

George Hadfield, Esq., seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

The Rev. D. Rhys. Stephen moved the second resolution. The reverend gentleman began by referring to the signal manner in which the education bill of Sir J. Graham was defeated four years and a half ago, not by members of the House of Commons, for he believed that a large majority of them would have voted for it, but by the common people of England, who were at the time unorganized, and without leaders. Earnest and thoughtful men amongst the Dissenters then thought it right that they should avail themselves of this remarkable fact in our history, and endeavor to form some central body to which it should be given in solemn charge to watch over the liberties of the Dissenting body. The result was the establishment of the British Anti-State Church Association, which was now in the third year of its existence, and although it had received little or no help from the London brethren, it had sustained no injury from open foes. The manly opposition of the latter he respected; the coldness and apathy of the former he lamented. The executive committee of the association had been very active; and he believed they had done nothing which an honest and Christian man need be ashamed of. Books had been pub-

lished, and lectures had been delivered; but the buyers of the one and the listeners to the other had pronounced both to be good; they would not scold and oppose, and therefore he had nothing to defend. He warned all who were half-hearted in this great and good cause not to pledge themselves to support this society; for measures were about to be adopted that would test the sincerity of every man. They intended to prosecute their object most strenuously, and if they carried it not before they died, they would leave it to their children to accomplish. He would rather leave to his children the name of a man who took up a principle from conviction of its truth, and adhered to it in spite of all obloquy and difficulty, than leave them any conceivable sum of money, and the name of half-hearted trucklers to expediency, who had no principle themselves, and cared not for it in others—(much cheering).

The Rev. Stephen Hooper seconded the resolution, which was also carried unanimously.

Thomas Price, D. D., Editor of the *Eclectic Review*, came forward amidst loud applause, and acknowledged, on the part of the executive committee, the resolution which had been adopted. He then proceeded to give a history of the construction and machinery of the British Anti-State Church Society, premising that the society had refrained from coming into Manchester until the noble struggle in which the town had been engaged for the achievement of free-trade had been triumphantly and happily terminated, and stating his belief that here the association would find its stronghold. The movement for the formation of this society originated in the midland counties, and memorials were sent to different bodies in London, which had been long constituted, inviting them to

co-operate; but the memorials were got rid of on technical objections, and in a way that was unworthy of those bodies. The parties in the midland counties then held a meeting in Leicester, and it was determined that a convention should be held in London. That convention was held in April, 1844. It was attended by 700 gentlemen, not as individuals, but as representatives of congregations and public meetings, of tens of thousands of people in all parts of the United Kingdom. They sat for three days, and their proceedings were characterized by unbroken harmony. They organized the association, not in any sectarian or exclusive spirit, but for the simple and sole object of effecting the separation of the religious body from the secular body. The organization was not opposed to one ecclesiastical form more than another; it was not antagonistic to Episcopacy any more than it was antagonistic to Presbyterianism or Congregationalism. It knew nothing of any sect or denomination; but it embraced all who were one with it in antagonism to state churchism. There belonged to it Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Methodists—all the infinite variety of sects which unhappily divided the Christian community. There belonged to it also some who bore no distinctive religious name, but who deemed a state church to be unfriendly to religion, or injurious to the civil interests of a nation. Such was the constitution of the society. Its machinery might be briefly described. Two bodies were organized, the one consisting of fifty persons residing in various parts of the empire, entitled the executive committee; the other, a general council of five hundred. This arrangement was made with a double view. The executive committee was to secure efficiency and continuity of operation; the general council, scattered in

various localities, throughout the whole kingdom, were regarded as central points for the spread of information and the furtherance of the contemplated object. And so solicitous were the framers of the society to guard against all cliqueship and local influence, and even that silent and imperceptible growth of power which attends human organizations, as well as to secure the continued vigor and healthfulness of young life, that it was determined that the society should every three years resolve itself into its original elements. At the expiration of the three years, another convention was to be held, the society reconstructed, officers and committees appointed, and such instructions given as might be advisable in the then circumstances of the empire. It was felt that there was some hazard in this; but it was thought the best mode for periodically infusing fresh life and vigor into the society. One part of the theory had not worked well. He frankly and unhesitatingly confessed that, to a great extent, the council of 500 had proved an ineffective and unworkable body, owing to the fact that the parties put upon it were to a great extent selected in ignorance of their views and intentions. He said this in order that any gentleman going up to London, at the next triennial convention, which would be held in the ensuing spring, might be prepared with the names of men in their locality who could be depended upon for furthering the cause in hand. The speaker next proceeded to point out, that although a retrospective view was not altogether without bright points, the Nonconformist body had hitherto confined themselves too much to what was called practical grievances. Now, however, it was felt that something was due to themselves, to their principles, and to their church — that, instead of the practical grievan

system, they should adopt an aggressive system, not against the Episcopal church as such, but against the Church of England as a state creation —a thing which the law had called into being, and which the law might therefore extinguish. It was felt that an aggressive movement was called for against this, as the most enormous and crying evil of the day—an evil, not simply in reference to religion, but also in relation to social life, and the general interest of the commonwealth. They determined therefore to give the society a title which could easily be understood, and which should designate its one object. From the first, they anticipated hard work, and much obloquy. They knew, from the history of past movements, what the early stages of all were; and they did not anticipate that, in a movement antagonistic to great interests, combining together large and influential classes—classes hitherto ruling to a great extent the destinies of our country, and still imprinting their character upon its laws—they did not imagine that such a movement was to be carried through its early, least popular, and least attractive stages, without drawing upon them much obloquy. They were prepared to meet with open and avowed opponents. They were aware that, in the nature of things, there must be hundreds and thousands of men who were as honestly attached to the State Church as they (the Dissenters) were opposed to it, who fully believed that it had the sanction of God's Holy Book, and was calculated to work great good. They knew nothing of that party which refused to give to the opposition of men in all other respects honorable, the same credit for sincerity which they claimed—(great cheering). And let those who would misrepresent the proceedings of the association bear witness to the fact, that they gave, in

thousands of instances, so far as integrity and earnestness were concerned, the same credit which they themselves claimed —(applause). They would endeavor to avoid misrepresenting others; and all they asked was, that others should be careful to avoid misrepresenting them — (cheers). When he remembered that they were in Manchester now, and that this was the first meeting they had held in the town, he confessed that he was cheered. There was something exhilarating in such a spectacle, after other scenes — (cheers). Having returned thanks on behalf of the Executive Committee, he said that the resolution would cause them to commit themselves more earnestly, if possible, to the course in which they were engaged. They should labor, God willing, till the work was brought to such a stage that others might take their posts and carry it on. Whatever personal sacrifices or toil might be incurred, his colleagues would freely bear it, until they were relieved by men whom they would heartily welcome to their ranks — (great and prolonged applause).

The Rev. Mr. Morris moved the next resolution. He alluded to the declaration of opinion made in that room by Lord Lincoln, in favor of the endowment of the Roman Catholic clergy, as an additional inducement for strong exertion at this period, to manifest their hostility to, and determination to abolish, all connection between the state and religion. They stood at the end of one great contest, the recollection of which ought to animate them; and in the present struggle they must bear in mind that they had the sympathy of some of those men who had been engaged in the now successful contest alluded to — nay, if possible, a more intense sympathy than they had manifested in the past contest — (cheers).

Edward Miall, Esq., editor of the *Nonconformist*, seconded the motion.

Mr. Brooks said a few words in support of the resolution, which was carried by acclamation.

The Rev. Dr. Nolan moved the fourth resolution, which was seconded by Mr. T. Falvey.

Mr. Prentice having been called on, briefly addressed the meeting. He begged to move a vote of thanks to the deputation for coming among them; and for himself and the meeting, he begged also to thank them for the instruction their able addresses had afforded them — (applause). He was sure they all felt grateful to these gentlemen, who would be assured by their presence on that occasion that the Dissenters of Manchester were all right.

Mr. William Burd, jun., seconded the motion. The deputation well deserved this expression of their feelings towards them in the laborious work in which they were engaged, especially when prosecuting it in parts of the country which might present less promising aspects and less encouragement — (applause).

The motion having been passed by acclamation,

Mr. Miall returned thanks on behalf of himself and Dr. Price.

Thanks were voted to the Chairman, and the meeting separated at a late hour.

[From the Irish Unitarian Magazine, Belfast, January, 1847.]

UNITARIANISM AND TRINITARIANISM AS THEY WERE AND AS THEY ARE.

That Abraham and his descendants, and that Jesus Christ and his disciples, paid divine adoration to the one living and true God, in distinction from the worship of many gods by the Gentiles, is plainly taught in the Holy Scriptures; nor can it be disputed by any one who is acquainted with the history of the world. But it must further be admitted, that the Christian Church, in the course of a few hundred years after its introduction, became gradually corrupted, until Romish superstition became the prevalent form of the Christian faith on the continent of Europe and in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. When this superstition had reached its height, and had enslaved the minds of the people by selling indulgences, denying the right of private judgment, and refusing the use of the Scriptures to the laity, the Protestant Reformation burst forth, three hundred years ago, maintaining the sufficiency of the Bible and the right of free inquiry in all matters of faith, worship, and religious duty. These great principles, however, were so far from being carried out, that the reformers generally have, in a great measure, assimilated their views to the Church from which they profess to dissent. Several of them have made apologies and assigned certain reasons for this accommodation. That the first reformers, born and brought up in a dark age and in the bosom of the Romish Church, should have made but a few steps towards primitive truth, is not to be wondered at; but, that their successors, enjoying the blessings of religious liberty and the free use of the Scriptures, should advocate the mainte-

nance of human creeds and human articles in the Churches, is much to be deplored. Such behavior is virtually a denial of the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures and of the principles of the Reformation. To this very hour, the Roman Catholic, the Protestant Episcopalian, and the Calvinistic Presbyterian Churches support and enforce the use of *human creeds;* and their creeds are one and the same in the inculcation of the doctrines of *original sin, the Trinity, the two natures of Christ, and of satisfaction to Divine justice.* These are the great and leading doctrines which *John Calvin* maintained when in the Church of Rome, and which his followers profess at the present time.

From this it is evident, that seceding from any one of these three Churches, and joining either of the remaining two, is but a slight change in as far as fundamental doctrines, so called, are concerned. Nor is the time long past,—only twenty-nine years, —when an inhabitant of this country would have been adjudged guilty of *felony*, and liable to *suffer the pains of death, as in the case of felony, without benefit of clergy*, for preaching or publishing that the Holy Ghost is not God, that Christ is not equal with the Father, or that Christ has not several natures. And the persecution and burning which took place under this and similar laws, have left a dark and broad stain on the memory of the Protestant Parliaments which enacted them, and on the memory of the Protestant people who took advantage of them, in the prosecution, imprisonment, and destruction of their fellow-men. The plainest reader may now perceive why it was that *Unitarianism* could make nothing more than silent progress until of late, and that *Trinitarianism* had prejudice, power, and popularity, all enlisted in its protection and propagation. A change, however, has taken place, and the

establishment of religious freedom in these and other lands, has enabled the leaders of free and fearless inquiry to arrest the attention of many humbler but kindred spirits, and to proclaim their faith in the grand and prominent doctrine of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, the doctrine of *one God, the Father.*

Within these fifty years, about two thousand five hundred Unitarian Christian congregations have been formed in the United States of America. In France, Germany, Transylvania, and Switzerland, the doctrine is making considerable progress, and saving numbers from that skepticism which has been often engendered by the dark dogmas of the Trinitarian churches.

Before the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, the Calvinistic Presbyterians of this country were wont to speak of the Unitarians of England as a mere handful of worthless beings, without influence, character or religion. But when it was planned by orthodox divines and speculative attorneys to evict them from the chapels which their forefathers had founded, and which they themselves had improved, it soon came to light that there were three hundred congregations, and that several of them were numerous, comprising within them many members of wealth, distinction and piety. The same undervaluing of the Irish Unitarian Christians has been attempted by the Calvinistic Presbyterians, who, notwithstanding their puffs as to numbers, are but a handful compared to the Roman Catholics. They are constantly boasting of their numbers and of the increase of their congregations, though it is quite evident that they are not increasing in proportion to the increase of their own population. They are so far from making proselytes from their fellow Trinitarians of the Episcopalian and Roman Catholic

Churches, that the balance is against them; and that they have lost many of their best members by the Unitarians is a plain matter of fact. Here they erect a meeting-house, and there they erect a meeting-house, and what is the consequence? They have by these erections much weakened several of their own congregations, without doing any injury to those that are Unitarian. To be sure a young minister may visit England or Scotland in search of pecuniary aid, and carry with him a testimonial containing an enumeration of the number of souls he has saved from the fatal errors of Arianism and Socinianism, whereas he has only gathered round him a number of Trinitarians from neighboring churches, others who had no connexion with any Christian society, several who had been disowned by Unitarians, and some who had acted in such a manner as to make them ashamed to enter a Unitarian place of worship where known. Yes, a man may have been baptized in his childhood by a Unitarian minister; he may, in the course of his education, have been altogether removed from the instruction of that minister, and yet, "attribute all his darkness and irreligion" to Unitarianism, of which he may die as ignorant as he was on the day of his baptism. All this may happen, and when Unitarians, in the spirit of charity, "attribute his irreligion" to *mental wanderings*, Trinitarians may endeavor to persuade the world that *they* have saved a soul from hell, though maintaining by their creed that the number of the elect and reprobate is "so definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished." When *smooth statements* are published, tending to persuade the credulous that certain conversions have taken place, nothing but respect for unfortunate relatives saves the imaginary converts and their confessors from the exposure which a detailed account of their conduct would justify. Perhaps Unitarians

manifest a mistaken charity in this way, and thus screen the "irreligion" of persons who were never seated at the table of Christ with them, nor even counted or coveted to be of their number. How frequently has it happened, that individuals who, conscious that their "irreligion" was known to Unitarians, would not dare to sit down at a communion-table with them, but who, nevertheless, have recommended themselves to this or that Trinitarian minister, by introducing themselves as former members of some Unitarian congregation. Did they produce a certificate of their membership? No. Did they ever pay any stipend? No; or perhaps their sitting was sold for arrears. Did the Unitarian minister ever baptize any of their children? Yes, perhaps a first, without fee or reward; and refused to baptize a second, because no attention was paid to previous promises.

It is almost impossible, without violating Christian charity, to expose the pretensions of many of the reputed orthodox Presbyterians as they merit. In this court, or before that bench of magistrates, we may witness one Calvinist swearing the directly opposite to another. In the New Testament we read of persons "who creep into houses and lead captive silly women;" and I could name several instances in which unsuspecting females have been flattered away from their places of public worship, where "dry morality and good works were taught," and the very Calvinists who sneered at these things became their seducers!!

The Rev. Dr. Brown, of Aghadowey, and late Moderator of the Irish General Assembly, in his "Narrative of Proceedings and Negotiations for Establishing a Presbyterian College in Ireland," speaks of a brother minister who "informed him that he feared they (the college committee) were

only manœuvring, and not really in earnest about the erection of a Presbyterian college; and, in time, he (the Doctor) discovered that his informant had formed a correct estimate of his brethren:" so I think there is a vast deal of manœuvring amongst the Calvinistic Presbyterians; and I take leave to refer the readers of the *Irish Unitarian Magazine* to Doctor Brown's "Narrative," for the confirmation of my opinion.

In addition to these things, I feel bound to state, that I am well acquainted with a Calvinistic Presbyterian, who, mistaking a fellow-traveller of Unitarian sentiments for one of his own communion, informed him that the attendance in a Unitarian meeting-house which he named, and which is near to his own residence, was seldom more than thirty, though it is seldom less than three hundred, and occasionally five. On sacramental occasions the communicants are generally from three hundred to three hundred and twenty.

Most of your readers have heard more or less about the supposed extinction of the ancient congregation of Templepatrick: but how gratifying it is to know that their meeting-house is in excellent order; that their respected pastor has completed the fiftieth year of his ministry, calculating from the date of his call; that public worship is well attended; and that, *thirty-five* young communicants came forward to the Lord's supper on a recent occasion. Let Unitarianism be plainly and directly taught, and many will be emancipated from confusion of mind, and not a few from the doubts which gloomy and contradictory doctrines have often originated. Christ, by his words and by his worship, gave plain and positive evidence of his Unitarianism; and all who "look unto him as the *author and finisher* of their *faith*," are bound to follow his example.

AN OLD UNITARIAN.

THE CREED OF UNITARIANS.

[From the London Inquirer, No. 236.]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE INQUIRER.

SIR, — Why have not the Unitarians a creed? Surely they have a certain settled belief upon some points. It may be short and vague, as compared with the creed of other churches; but still there is some ground which they must take, as distinguishing them from other sects; or why separate and secede?

To be without a creed, is to lay yourself open to the charge of wishing to entice, under unfixed and undetermined ideas, all sorts of men to take seats in your chapels, and contribute (that chief point in Dissent) to the minister's salary, and the current expenses of the chapel.

I suppose that all who go to your chapels may be agreed upon one point, — namely, the Unity of God. Is this enough? is this a sufficient bond of union? I think not; for, if so, where is the difference between Unitarians and Deists. And yet many Unitarians would be offended if they were called Deists.

The characteristics of Unitarianism must, then, lie in something else. What is this something? This I want fixed and determined, and written in a creed. Is it belief in the Scriptures? Then the question is, in all or in parts of the Scriptures? Do we take the first and second chapters of Matthew, which have been questioned by Priestley and Belsham? Either, as a body of sectaries, we do or we do not. I think it is but fair to controversialists of the orthodox school to state this fairly and openly, for they otherwise do not know where to meet us; for one Unitarian may be prepared to admit these two chapters, and another may not. And

in the field of discussion, the orthodox cannot tell which is the recognised belief of the sect. He feels he is fighting with a Parthian.

I suspect there are two well-defined systems of opinion among the Unitarians, — those who take their belief as their fathers handed it to them, — and those who have given their adhesion to the bold hypotheses of Strauss and Hennell, Evanson and Middleton. I believe the laying down, in writing, a creed acceptable to the first, would cause the instant secession of the latter. This secession had better take place. Let us not comfort ourselves with the belief that there is peace, when there is no peace. To take the adhesion of these latter by means of a vague, unwritten understanding, is a mere wilful shutting of the eyes to differences which really exist. J. H.

[The Unitarians have no creed, because they account no man answerable to a fellow-man for his opinions. They know of no authority by which a creed can be enforced; each judges for himself what is true and what is essential, and acts according to his own judgment and conscience in respect to the steps he takes for making known his opinions, and inviting attention to them. Every one, however, who takes upon himself or willingly accepts the name of Unitarian, or joins any avowedly Unitarian association, does, to a certain extent, profess a creed. *Unitarian* is used in opposition to *Trinitarian*, and expresses belief in the strict personal unity of God, as opposed to the mysterious doctrine of three persons in the unity of the Deity. This carries along with it, of course, belief in the paternal character and unpurchased mercy of God, and denial of the doctrines of Original Sin and the total Depravity of the Human Race. On other matters,

Unitarians could not well have a creed, even if they did not dislike one for fear of its imposition, because they differ much amongst themselves; and they see no good to arise from insisting on non-essentials, so as to break a union founded on important agreement. Every one understands that, by the term Unitarians, Christians are meant; and that mere Theists, though holding the same views with them in many important particulars, are a different class. We do not pretend to be responsible for the opinions of all who listen to our services. It is well known to all that we employ no test, and that, if they like to come among us, they receive a ready welcome; but ours are Christian services, and those who deny this do so either because they allow the name Christian only to their own views of the Gospel, or because they dare to propagate calumnious reports. The question respecting the genuineness of the accounts of the miraculous conception is interesting to the critical inquirer, but not of the least doctrinal importance. Unitarians differ in judgment upon it, and there is no reason whatever why they should be called to make a profession. Orthodox opponents must be content to take us as free, independent individuals, none of whom will be responsible for what others think and say. On what authority does our correspondent class Evanson or Middleton with Strauss and Hennell? There would be abundance of disagreement about creeds among those who are far enough removed in opinion from these latter gentlemen; and if some few who think with them are amongst us, how will the search after truth be aided by expelling them? There is peace always in unfettered freedom of inquiry, and the acknowledgment of responsibility to God alone. No peace is ever obtained by attempts at creed-making; nor will such attempts, we imagine, ever meet

with acceptance amongst the English Presbyterians. They are, and will remain, non-subscribers. The remark, that it is a chief point in Dissent to obtain contributions to the minister's salary, is as much mistaken in fact as it is ungenerous in feeling. It is notoriously the more common fault of officials in Dissenting chapels to be afraid to ask new comers to contribute, as in justice and reason they ought to do, for fear of frightening them away from the place, being chiefly anxious to have them as hearers; and how Dissenting ministers are paid, as compared with the education they are expected to possess, and the station they are understood to occupy, need not be enlarged upon.—Ed.]

[From the London Inquirer, No. 236.]

THOMAS CLARKSON.

We find a letter from Mrs. Clarkson in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*, which, with the introduction by the editor, we think it right to copy. The statement respecting Mr. Clarkson's views is strangely at variance with the apparent intention of the last paper, written by this venerable man, and which is before our readers. The subject, however, may probably receive some further elucidation.

"The following letter from the widow of the late President of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society will be read with deep interest by the friends of the anti-slavery cause on both sides of the Atlantic; and be deemed a sufficient refutation of the plea set up by certain parties, that they are now to be regarded as the representatives of that

truly great man. The letter from Mrs. Clarkson is the official acknowledgment of the minute of the Anti-Slavery Committee, relating to the lamented decease of her husband, which was inserted in the last Reporter: —

"Playford Hall, December 24th, 1846.

"Dear Sir, — I beg you will assure the Chairman and members of the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, that I am duly sensible of their kindness in making a special communication of the resolutions recording their estimation of my deceased husband's character, addressed, as that resolution is, to the wide community of the friends of mankind.

"I rejoice that it is in my power to bear testimony to the perfect truth of the statement of the Committee, 'that, to the latest period of my husband's existence, the Committee enjoyed his full confidence, and that the measures which they have pursued in promoting the great objects of their Association, were in entire accordance with his mature judgment.' At the same time, the character of his mind, equally hopeful and charitable, led him to put the fairest construction on the acts of all the friends of the African race; and he was more inclined to consider all acts which proceeded from other bodies, as varied means for the attainment of the common end, than critically to examine whether such other proceedings and acts were in perfect harmony with those which emanated from the Society of which he was the President. And I am sure that he would have at once repudiated and disclaimed participation in any act which appeared to him capable of being considered directly or by implication, opposed to or at variance with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

"I feel the worth of the sympathy which you have expressed to me in the name of the Committee, and beg you to thank them for it.

"I remain yours, very sincerely,

(Signed) CATHARINE CLARKSON.

"To John Scoble, Esq."

It must be a subject of great regret to all genuine friends of human improvement to see the opponents of slavery divided into parties, and not only unable to act together, but even reproaching one another. Is not this an evil which may be remedied?

[From the London Inquirer, No. 239.]

"LET'S MAKE IT UP."

HOMELY words may we deem them,— the season has flown
When we heard them from others, or made them our own;
Yet, would that their spirit of sweetness and truth
Could come to our ears as it came in our youth:
Oh! would that we uttered as freely as then,
"*Let us make it up*, brother, smile kindly again.
"Let's make it up."

Let us make it up, brother; oh, when we were young
No pride stayed the words ere they fell from the tongue;
No storms of dissension, no passions that strove,
Could banish forever the peace-making dove,
If 't was frighted awhile from its haven of rest,
It returned at the sounds that could please it the best, —
"*Let 's make it up.*"

Let us make it up, brother; oh, let us forget
How it is that so coldly of late we have met;
Where the fault may be resting, we 'll stay not to tell —
Its curse on the spirits of both of us fell.
So take my hand firmly, and grasp as of yore,
Let heart whisper to heart as they whispered before, —
"*Let 's make it up.*"

CHARLOTTE YOUNG.

KING CHARLES THE MARTYR.*

A FORM is imposed upon the nation for both morning and evening prayer, in which confession is made "on behalf of all the land" of our blood-guiltiness, and supplications are offered up that the judgments of Heaven may not fall upon us and our posterity, in revenge of this sin of our fathers. The service of the day is therefore a national religious act; and those that think, as I do, that the uses of religion are perverted by this annual solemnity, are bound to remonstrate against it, candidly, indeed, but explicitly and boldly. No blame rests upon the worshippers in the Established Church; they have no choice in the matter; multitudes of them are as much scandalized as any others can be at the unreasonable and uncharitable service. In adverting to it, I have not in view the reputation or interest of any religious sect, much less of any political party, but simply, the great and united cause of justice, truth and freedom. The epithets which the Liturgy affixes to the name of King Charles I.—strange epithets to be pronounced before Almighty God in the House of Prayer!—and the secret parallel which is drawn between him and our Saviour in their sufferings and death, a parallel which no common words would serve to characterize justly, may be passed by; but the vital interests of the country demand that we should not canonize as a "blessed

* "A Form of Prayer, with Fasting, to be used yearly on the Thirtieth of January, being the day of Martyrdom of the Blessed King CHARLES the First; to implore the mercy of God, that neither the guilt of that sacred and innocent blood, nor those other sins by which God was provoked to deliver up both us and our King into the hands of cruel and unreasonable men, may at any time hereafter be visited upon us or our posterity."—*Book of Common Prayer.*

martyr," a prince who fell in the attempt to establish arbitrary power and to subdue men's consciences to a thraldom, equal in its grievousness and ignominy to that of Rome in the proudest day of the Inquisition, or give up to revilings and maledictions the names of our forefathers who stood up, at the call of both patriotism and religion, "in liberty's defence,"—who devoted to the well-being of their posterity their treasure and their blood,—and to whose wisdom, constancy and valor we owe the high reputation of England amongst the nations, and the unspeakable blessings which have been ever since growing up from their labors, blessings both civil and religious. They had their faults; the opposite party were not without their virtues; as far as we are just and wise, we shall approve only what was right and good on either side; but, impartial History has already, I apprehend, decided in favor of our Hampden, Pym, Milton and Sydney, and the present language and forms of our national institutions are, in a great measure, in unison with their designs, wishes and prayers for their beloved country. Let me not be understood to express complacency in the shedding of human blood, whether by the sword or on the scaffold. I deplore the necessity, real or supposed, of this last of human ills. I say only, in answer to the appeal that our fathers on both sides of the contest have made to us their posterity, that Time has recorded his judgment in favor of the advocates of freedom, and that it is fighting against Time and against the sense and feeling, the knowledge and spirit of the age, to keep up holy days and religious forms, fasts and festivals, which were meant in the first instance as a triumph over those that were thought to be for ever fallen, and which were further calculated and framed to consecrate tyranny and to bow down the under-

standings of the people, by means of the yoke put upon their consciences, to the unrighteous and degrading doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance, — doctrines which the history of Europe shows to be not only destructive of the best interests of the people, but also fatal in the end even to the just power of their rulers. — *Sermons on various Subjects, chiefly Practical, by* Robert Aspland, pp. 42 – 45.

DOUBT.

Most remote was Jesus, who no less mildly than ceaselessly bore with the ignorance, distrust, open disbelief and denial of his immediate followers, from blaming that uncertainty of mind which a faithful use of the means of information had not removed, and which, in its inevitable consequences of pain and weakness, was attended by severe penalties. As little would Paul approve of the use which is often ignorantly made of the words, "He that doubts is damned," so as to alarm the timid inquirer, make the bold hesitate, and throw around a certain set of opinions, "framed by art and man's device" many centuries ago, and in ages of mental tyranny and darkness, the awful and terrific sanctions of endless burnings or immortal bliss. After such a manner Paul had not learned Christ; and the entire chapter whence these words are taken (Rom. xiv.), shows that the meaning ordinarily put upon them is a perversion. — *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. Doubt.

[From the London Inquirer, No. 235.]

THE DYING FLOWER.

The gale sweeps by — the drooping flower
  Serenely bows its graceful head,
Resigned that, in a brighter hour,
  Its fragrance o'er the path was shed.

The glowing morn, in fresh array
  Attired its charms, its beauty blest;
And the last smile of closing day
  Lingered upon its gentle breast.

The sparkling waters at its side
  Nourished the opening buds with care,
Exulting that the crystal tide
  Gave back their softest blushes there.

The star of eve, with tranquil beam,
  From her lone vigil in the sky,
The things of earth, perchance, might deem
  Look'd half as fair as those on high.

But autumn comes — the gale sweeps by —
  The stricken flower is prostrate laid;
And the wild winds, with passing sigh,
  Lament its fate through bower and shade.

Its scattered leaves and blighted form
  "To dust return;" but in that hour
A voice is heard amidst the storm,
  "The hand which strikes revives the flower!"

And see! above the tempest's gloom,
  The bow of promise bending!
And, o'er the darkness of the tomb,
  The radiant arch extending!

Ipswich, Dec. 1846. M. B.

THE

UNITARIAN.

[From the Inquirer, No. 243.—London, 1847.]

STATE OF RELIGION IN GERMANY.

In accordance with what I proposed at the close of my last letter, I shall now proceed to state, as briefly as possible, the main features of the two Creeds of Breslau and Schneidemühl, upon which the two sections, into which the infant German Catholic Church has been unfortunately split, are respectively based. The difference between these two Confessions of Faith is, that the one was originally based upon the Nicene, and the other upon the Apostles' Creed. Not that these creeds have been adopted word for word; far from it; the Nicene has been modified by the compilers of the Schneidemühl Confession of Faith, although without prejudice to any of the doctrines therein enunciated — while the Apostles' Creed has, as I observed when narrating the formation of the Breslau congregation, undergone much more important modifications, has been made, indeed, a new Creed, more in accor-

dance with the Rationalistic or sceptical spirit of German society.

The Schneidemühl Confession of Faith is based upon the Nicene Creed; adopts, with little variation, all its main doctrines; acknowledges the divinity of Christ and his miraculous conception, the personality of the Holy Ghost, and his equal claims to worship and adoration with the Father and Son, &c. It rejects all tradition, and acknowledges the Holy Scriptures as the only sure fountain of Christian faith. It receives seven sacraments, as instituted by Christ; namely, Baptism, Confirmation, the Lord's Supper, Penitence, Ordination, Marriage, and Extreme Unction; and asserts that, in all these sacraments, there is a communication of grace. It is affirmed that the memory of the bloody sacrificial death of Christ upon the cross, which is celebrated in the Mass, may be profitable both to the living and the dead; and that, in the most holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, with his soul and Godhead, are truly, really and actually present; and that, by faith, the whole substance of the wine is changed into his blood, and the whole substance of the bread into his body. The power of the priests to forgive sins is denied; the supremacy of the Pope is rejected, as also the prohibition of mixed marriages; the withholding of the cup from the laity in the administration of the Lord's Supper; the use of the Latin language in the celebration of the Mass; the invocation of saints; and the worship of relics. Finally, the Romish doctrine of Purgatory is rejected. But our Father's house has many mansions; and, for those who here upon earth have not made themselves worthy to be admitted into the immediate presence of God, a progressive advancement and purification of the soul is

recognized; while, as a corollary to this doctrine, the prayers of the living for the dead, but not of the dead for the living, are admitted to be of efficacy.

The Breslau Confession of Faith rejects all the distinguishing doctrines of Popery, without qualification; acknowledges the Bible as the only source of Christian faith; maintains, in the broadest terms, the most unrestrained right of free inquiry and private judgment; while, in place of the Apostles' Creed, the following short and simple articles of Belief, from which, as the reader will observe, all allusions to any points of a miraculous or strictly supernatural character, are carefully excluded, is adopted:—

"I believe in God the Father, who, through his Almighty word, has created the world, and rules it in wisdom, justice, and love.

"I believe in Jesus Christ, our Saviour, who, by his doctrines, his life, and his death, has delivered us from the slavery of sin.

"I believe in the working of the Holy Spirit upon earth.

"I believe in a universal Christian Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, and an eternal life. Amen."

Only two sacraments are admitted—Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In respect to the first, the practice of infant baptism, and the rite of confirmation, are retained. The Lord's Supper is to be administered to the laity in both forms, and this sacrament is defined as a memorial feast of the sufferings and death of Christ. Marriage is recognized as a sacred institution, ordained by God; but all the conditions and restrictions relating to the marriage contract are, in opposition to the preposterous claims of the Romish clergy, declared to fall

within the province of the civil power alone. In like manner, only those Church holidays are retained which are recognized by the State. All fees for the performance of the different religious rites, marriages, burials, christenings, &c., are abolished. The Church government is placed in the hands of the congregation, from which all power emanates. The clergyman is chosen by the members; the right of voting is universal, and the congregation is represented by the clergyman and a certain number of elders, to be chosen annually.

The Leipsic Committee appear to have issued their circular summons for a General Council to fifteen congregations, exclusive of those of Breslau and Schneidemühl. Of these fifteen, twelve may be classed with the Breslau, and three with the Schneidemühl Creed. Eleven of these fifteen accepted the invitation, and sent deputies to the Council, while two, of whose existence the Leipsic Committee had not been cognisant, and who had, therefore, received no invitation, nevertheless sent deputies; so that, in all, there were thirteen congregations, exclusive of those of Breslau and Schneidemühl, represented in the Council. Of these thirteen, eight may be placed in the former, and three in the latter class, while two are doubtful, but believed to belong to the Breslau division. Of the fifteen congregations which I have placed in this latter category, the Confessions of Faith of two are little more than negative. Two, again, adopted the Apostles' Creed, without alteration, and the remaining eight adopted all the articles of the Breslau Creed, either word for word, or with only few and unimportant modifications. Those additions and alterations which were made by the Dresden congregation, were the most numerous and the most important; but as all these were afterwards embodied in

the Leipsic resolutions, and will therefore, in their place, receive a more particular notice, I shall not dwell upon them here.

The discrepancies between the original Schneidemühl Creed, and those of the congregations which I have classed with it, were, although unessential, more numerous, and of greater importance; and I will, therefore, briefly notice a few of the most material. The Berlin differs from the Schneidemühl Creed in the following respects: — 1. The latter declares the Scriptures to be the only source of Christian Faith, while the former concedes a certain authority to tradition, but only when this latter source of Christian truth is supplemental to the Bible, or at least in perfect accordance with it. 2. The Berlin Creed rejects, in express and emphatic terms, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but, at the same time, affirms that the communicant receives the bread and wine in the real spiritual presence of the Saviour. 3. While the Schneidemühl Creed acknowledges seven, the Berlin receives only two sacraments; viz., Baptism, and the Lord's Supper; but recognizes the remaining five sacraments of the Romish Church, as pious usages, sanctified by tradition. 4. The Schneidemühl Creed rejects, without modification, the celibacy of the clergy, pilgrimages and indulgences, the invocation of saints, the priest's power of imparting absolution, and the practice of confession; while the Berlin Creed, on the contrary, rejects, indeed, all these doctrines and practices, but all of them with more or less of reservation, and with qualifying terms, more or less strong. Lastly, the Schneidemühl Creed is silent respecting the constitution of the Church, and the powers of the congregation; while the Berlin Creed contains a series of articles

upon these questions, essentially the same as those embodied in the Breslau Confession of Faith.

In like manner, the Confession of Faith of the Elberfeld congregation, the next in importance of those which have adopted the Schneidemühl Creed, admits the authority of tradition, so far as it is supplemental to, or does not contradict, Scripture. Only two sacraments, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, are received as instituted by Christ; but the other five sacraments of the Romish Church are acknowledged to impart grace, and to be rites which the Church has ordained in the spirit of Christ; while, with respect to the transformation of the elements at the Lord's Supper, the article of the Schneidemühl Creed is adopted, word for word. The principle of progressive advancement in the comprehension of Christian truth is recognized in the following paragraph:—"We subject this Creed to a further development, to be based upon deeper inquiry into the Scriptures, through the co-operation of the Holy Spirit." This Creed contains no articles referring to the constitution of the Church; but the Articles of Faith are declared to be subject to the final decision of a General Council, by which the modifications which may be deemed necessary are to be made, and additional articles, if deemed requisite, framed.

From the above statement, it will be seen that, in respect both to the negative and positive articles of faith, there existed very considerable differences between the scattered congregations of the New Church. Schneidemühl, Berlin, Elberfeld and Hildesheim went more timidly to work in their renunciation of properly Romish doctrines, and, in many instances, either wholly retained these doctrines, or modified their rejection of them by various reservations and qualifications. The Breslau congregation

and those of the same category, rejected all these distinguishing doctrines of the Romish Church, without distinction, and with an absence of all qualifying phrases; and we find in their creeds no clinging, as in some of the others, to every scrap of Romish doctrine, which by any possibility could be retained. Not only do the congregations which gave in their adherence to the Schneidemühl Creed differ among each other as to the number of the sacraments instituted by Christ himself; some acknowledging seven, and others only two; but as a class, they differ more or less from the Breslau section of the Church in the different views which they appear to entertain of the nature and meaning of a sacrament. The former congregations incline much more nearly to the Romish idea, and seem to conceive of some mysterious virtue resident in these rites, and to regard them as essential to salvation; the views of the latter, on the contrary, are simple and rational, and they regard the Lord's Supper, for example, simply as a memorial meal of the death of Christ, and an emblem of the brotherhood which exists among all Christians. But however important these differences may at first sight appear, it is certain that they alone would never have caused disunion, or given rise to serious dissension in the Church. That principle adopted by the Leipsic council, by which a distinction is made between the Church and the individual congregations, and the latter are allowed perfect liberty to draw up additional or supplementary articles, thus giving to the original creed such interpretations and explanations as are agreeable to their views, would have effectually obviated all danger of dissension and disunion upon these points, since all parties were agreed in regarding them as by no means belonging to the essential doctrines of Christianity. It was from the

positive articles of faith alone, from the question relating to the person of Christ and the mode in which his mission and death operate for the redemption of the world, that disunion was to be feared, and after experience has unfortunately confirmed to a certain extent these apprehensions.

To unite these two opposing elements in the Church, to reduce all these conflicting articles into one common creed, was the task which now devolved upon the council at Leipsic. It is no exaggeration to say that the eyes of all Germany were fixed upon their deliberations. The resolutions adopted at this council would not only decide the position which the new Church was to occupy, but must besides exercise a great influence over the course of religious development in Germany. In this infant community, those two conflicting principles had already showed themselves, which for years had been struggling together in the bosom of the Protestant Church, and the result of these deliberations must inevitably greatly strengthen the one, and give a "heavy blow and great discouragement" to the other of these two contending parties. The contest which was now to be decided at Leipsic was a contest between progress and stagnation, between freedom of thought and belief and the slavery of creeds, between practical and dogmatic Christianity. The object of the one party was to base the church upon a dogma, to obtain the incorporation and special recognition of their favorite doctrines in the creed of the New Church, while the aim of the other section was to pass over in silence all disputed points of speculative theology, to form their confession of faith upon the broadest basis, upon points upon which all Christians are agreed, leaving to the separate congregations the liberty of adding to these general articles such spe-

cial provisions as they might deem expedient, always provided that the latter were not inconsistent with the fundamental principles embodied in the general creed. The question to be decided was, Can the Orthodox and the Rationalist unite cordially together upon the basis of the great practical truths of Christianity? Can Orthodox doctrines and Rationalistic views exist peaceably side by side in the bosom of the same church? And the answer to these questions obviously depended upon the relative importance attached by the former of these parties to dogmas and to practice. Before this union could take place, it was, above all things, necessary that those holding orthodox views as to the person of Christ, and the mode of operation of his death and sufferings, should lay aside all narrow feeling, should cordially acknowledge their opponents to be fellow Christians, and while adhering to their own favorite doctrines, should not confine themselves within these narrow limits, but, recognizing their essential subordination to the great practical precepts of the Gospel, should not refuse the right hand of Christian fellowship, or deny the Christian name to those who rejected them. It was evident that the only course by which this union could be effected was, to pass over in silence all those speculative theological questions which have divided the Christian Church for ages, since to base the Church upon a dogma, upon any particular views, whether Unitarian or Trinitarian, as to the person of Christ and the means of salvation, would have been equivalent to a direct exclusion of the one or the other of these two parties from the communion of the Church.

The summons to a general council at Leipsic was promptly accepted by the majority of those congregations to which it was addressed. The

greater number immediately proceeded to elect deputies, while others declared beforehand their readiness to abide by the resolution which the council might form. Both Ronge and Czerski, however, were averse to holding a general council at such an early period in the history of the Church; they thought that more time should be allowed for the spread of the movement, for the formation of other congregations, as well as to give opportunities to the lower Catholic clergy to give in their adhesion to the infant community, and both suggested the expediency of postponing the proposed synod at least until Whitsuntide. But these suggestions came too late; the day appointed for the opening of the council was at hand, and many of the deputies were already upon their way to Leipsic. To postpone the synod was, therefore, impossible, and the Leipsic committee, however desirous they naturally were to meet the wishes of the two founders of the Church, were obliged to adhere to the day originally fixed upon. Neither Ronge nor Czerski were present at the first three sittings of the council. The latter arrived at Leipsic on the third day after the opening of the deliberations, and took part in the discussions of the fourth meeting, when the debate upon the articles of faith, which had been expressly postponed to give him and Ronge an opportunity of being present, was proceeded with. Ronge did not arrive at Leipsic till the fourth day, and only attended the fifth and last meeting of the council.

The number of congregations which sent deputies to this council was, as I have before observed, in all fifteen. The total number of deputies was thirty; but, at the first three sittings, the number present never exceeded twenty, and even at the deliberations of the fourth and most important meeting of

all, only twenty-four attended. At the fifth meeting, the number was increased, by the arrival of Ronge and other deputies, to twenty-eight. The number of deputies for each congregation varied from five to one, about half contenting themselves with a single representative.

The Breslau articles of faith, as modified by the Dresden congregation, were adopted as the basis of the deliberations of the council. The different articles are arranged under four heads, of which the first relates to the articles of belief, and the three last to the constitution and discipline of the Church. These three last sections formed the subject of the deliberations of the three first meetings, and the Dresden articles were adopted almost word for word, and with only a few unimportant modifications. From the unanimity which prevailed upon these points, but little occurred worthy of special notice, and, as I propose at a future period to give a summary of the creed and statutes framed by the council, I shall pass hastily over the proceedings of these first three sittings, in order to sketch more fully the discussion of the fourth and most important meeting.

Coming from the most various districts, from Schneidemühl in the East, to Elberfeld in the West, the greater number of the deputies were necessarily personally unknown to each other. A private preliminary meeting of all those who had already arrived at Leipsic, was therefore held, on the evening of the 22d, to give them an opportunity of becoming personally acquainted with each other, of discussing the prospects of their church, and the state of feeling and opinion in their respective congregations. The same deep sense of the importance of their mission, the same spirit of charity and forbearance which marked the whole of the subse-

quent deliberations, manifested itself on this occasion, and the company separated with the unanimously expressed wish that their last meeting might pass off as peaceably, as harmoniously and as cordially as the first.

[From the Christian Reformer — London, March, 1847.]

ORIGINAL LETTER FROM THE LATE DR. PARR.

SIR, — When Mr. Williams was preparing his Life of Mr. Belsham, I was requested to look through the correspondence which he had carried on for many years with his friend Mr. Broadbent, of Warrington, and to make such extracts as might furnish materials for the work. Some of these were not made use of, and amongst them the accompanying copy of a letter from Dr. Parr. It seems to me so exceedingly characteristic of the learned writer, and so likely to interest the readers of the Christian Reformer, that I place it at your disposal for publication, if you agree in my opinion.

WILLIAM GASKELL.

Manchester, Upper Rumford Street, Feb. 6, 1847.

"DEAR, EXCELLENT, AND MUCH RESPECTED MR. BELSHAM, —

"I thank you for sending me your Sermon, and your Reply to Moysey and Magee. The composition of both is very good indeed, and as controversial pieces they do credit to your sagacity. Mousey is a silly and a shallow scribbler, but the castigation which you have inflicted upon him was quite merited by the tone of triumph and accusation which

he assumed. I cared little about him and his book. But I applaud, dear Sir, and I thank you for your refutation of Magee. In the whole varied and extensive compass of my reading, I never met with a more tiresome or a more unsatisfactory book than his two volumes on the Atonement. I read them at Oxford, and I resolved not to buy them; but I must borrow the third volume when I can, and my indignation will supply me with patience to go through it. He is not a classical, nor even a theological scholar. He spends 40 pages upon matter that would not employ you and me for more than two. His talent is not for reasoning, but for declamation. And this I have said repeatedly and undisguisedly in the presence of dignified ecclesiastics. Upon the subject itself I pronounce no opinion, and I listen attentively to controversalists on both sides of the question. You gladden my soul by exposing not merely the dogmatism, but the dishonesty of Magee. You have left him no refuge in explanation. Some intelligent and distinguished persons in Ireland are well acquainted with my opinion of him, as a shallow scholar, a feeble reasoner, a pompous declaimer, and an uncharitable slanderer; but his orthodoxy and his zeal will procure for him a mitre. I have desired one of my Irish correspondents to read your admirable book.

"Now, dear Sir, I shall not apologize to you for the sorrow I feel from your introduction of Bishop Howley's name, and my disapprobation of the opprobrious word Popish as applicable to the Church of England. These, I believe, are the only two instances of which I have had occasion now and then to lament in your other controversial writings. Let me entreat you to give up the vaunting word 'march.' It is quite unworthy of such a man as Mr. Belsham. Let me put you on your guard

against another sectarian word, 'spread.' Priestley was too fond of it, and never will it be adopted by men of taste.

"Mr. Belsham, you have the happiness to write better as you write more, and you must be sensible that I state my objections from motives of sincere good-will and respect. I beg of you to buy for me Dr. Wallis's Sermon. Pray exert yourself to get it for me. If in one of your visits to Birmingham you will call at my parsonage, I will lend you some tracts that were published more than 100 years ago, and will convince you that the Unitarian scheme was well known in this country long before Dr. Lardner's book.

"You are right in denying the name of Arian to some of your contemporaries who contend for the pre-existence of Christ. Arius did indeed maintain that pre-existence, but he did more. He contended for a high degree of divinity. He allowed direct worship. He considered Christ as a sort of secondary Δημιουργος. He admitted the personality of the Spirit, which our contemporaries deny. Did you ever read a small work of Athanasius against the Macedonians, who were Binitarians? Tell our reverend friend Dr. Rees, that, upon a principle of analogy, I have found a name for him. He is not with Athanasius an Homoousian; he is not with Eusebius an Homoiousian; he is not with Arius a believer in the personality of the Spirit; he does admit pre-existence; and now you shall have his name — he is a Prousian [*Preousian ?*]. Tell him so from me.

"I beg my best compliments to Dr. Rees and Dr. Lindsay; and I have the honor to be, with great respect,

"Your friend and obedient servant,

"SAMUEL PARR.

"Pray tell me what is the price of Bishop Newcome's Version and of your new Unitarian Version; I possess neither; but I want to buy them both at the cheapest rate.

"March 6, 1819 — Hatton."

CRITICAL NOTICES.

[From the Christian Reformer — London, March, 1847.]

An Exposition of the Vulgar and Common Errors, adapted to the Year of Grace MDCCCXLV. By THOMAS BROWN REDIVIVUS, whilome Knt. and M. D. 18mo. Pp. 132. London: Pickering.

THIS interesting volume of Essays, which we have too long allowed to remain unnoticed, is full of moral wisdom. It is one of Mr. Pickering's series of "Small Books on Great Subjects, edited by a few Wellwishers to Knowledge." The work contains a little theology, which is liberal and just, and a great deal of practical religion. Its characteristic is, perhaps, judgment rather than originality. In the well-traversed field of morals, the latter quality is generally procured at the expense of truth. The volume opens with a short essay "Of the Causes of Common Errors." It then treats of Vulgar Errors in the way of Common Sayings. It is indeed true, as our author observes, that many phrases do come to be received as current coin in the world, which for certain were never lawfully

stamped in the mint of either religion or reason. (P. 19.) Among the brass shillings of society, the writer has picked out the following as fit only to be nailed to the counter: *A young man must sow his wild oats. A good fellow, nobody's enemy but his own. We must do as others do. He that spareth the rod spoileth the child. Children should not ask questions. A boy should be manly. A man is not responsible for his belief. Women have no concern with politics. Marriage is a lottery. You cannot put an old head on young shoulders. Ne sutor ultra crepidam* (Let not the Shoemaker go beyond his last.) *A little learning is a dangerous thing. I will retire from business and prepare for another world. It is only a white lie.*

Some of these topics require delicate handling. In some of these current sayings there is a little pure silver mixed with the baser metal. This the author has carefully extracted before he has thrown the other away. Thus, on the subject of responsibility and belief, he begins by stating the "undeniable truth" that man's mind is so framed that he cannot believe without proof, and "therefore he remaineth free from blame, if, from poverty, he be misinstructed, and thereby his faith be starved; or, if from ill instruction, he be supplied with prejudice only, and thereby his faith be poisoned; or, if from being born in a pagan country, the light hath not arrived at him, and therefore the seed of faith hath not been able to germinate."—Pp. 34, 35.

He proceeds to shew that if a man's errors arise from his own wilful inattention and indolence, then is he responsible for them. It is sometimes said in such a case, the man is not responsible for his opinions, but for the faults that produced them. But is not this, after all, a distinction without a difference?

The following remarks upon "religious knowledge," and on the connection therewith of "reasoning," are excellent:

"It is a strange notion of many well-intentioned persons, that religious knowledge doth differ from all other; and that it cometh by prayer only, and not by study. How shall the man pray who knoweth not or believeth not the necessity for prayer? But when study hath roused his attention, then there will be some likelihood that, like the treasurer of Queen Candace, he will find out his own ignorance, and seek for some man to teach him; yea, look on high for the instruction of that Divine Teacher who is ever ready to make them wise who seek for true wisdom.

"It hath never been my luck to know one whose faith bore right good fruit, who had not reasoned thereupon; for as St. Clement of Alexandria doth truly say, 'faith is knowledge and knowledge is faith;' God having so constituted them that they naturally lean on each other, by turns leading and being led."—Pp. 35, 36.

What our author's views on education are, the reader may guess from the following introductory remarks on the *base* saying, *Children should not ask questions:*

"I remember once hearing of the fellow of a college at Oxford, whose training had been in the days when University-men could go deeper into a bottle of port than a problem of Euclid, who exclaimed against the evil practice of allowing children to be inquisitive. 'A child cometh up to one, now-a-days,' cried this remnant of the old times, 'and asketh me the diameter of the moon; now, I don't know what is the diameter of the moon, and I don't like to be asked such questions.' This old gentleman was at least honest, and confessed without reserve, the real cause of his objection. If others would be as honest, I have little doubt that we should find the very strenuous objections made to children's inquisitiveness and eagerness to search into *omne scibile*, to have its origin in a like cause; their elders *do not know the diameter*

of the moon. But meseemeth that even though the former generation should have been ignorant of many useful things, they have not any right thereby engendered to choke the spring of knowledge for the young, even though their searching inquiries should disclose how little the old had drunk of it; and he must have been a bad parent who hath gained so little of the affection of his child by his kindliness, as to have any fear that he shall attract his mockery by his want of erudition. A better answer would such a parent give, even in that case, were he to say, 'My child, when I was young, no one would answer my questions; and therefore, to my regret, I remained ignorant of much that I wished to know. But, my dear child, I will not so deal with thee; and therefore, though to this question of thine I am unable to give an answer of mine own science, yet as happily we have in this age, books that will tell us this, and much more, we will together seek this out, and then we shall both be the wiser.' Nor need any one fear the being lightly esteemed by his children for this plain-spoken sincerity; for the lesson thus learned is made pleasant by the very circumstance that it is participated in by the parent, not dogmatically enforced; and the child will rather wish that much of his learning should be thus acquired, than that he should run the hazard of being rebuked for slowness of apprehension by one who already knoweth what he hath to explain."—Pp. 28–30.

The volume closes with six essays, of various merit. In the fifth, entitled "Of Errors in regard to Disease and Medicine," are some most just and beautiful observations on the fitting employments of the sick room.

"Many a great mind," the author observes, "hath matured in a sick room, works which make it evident that the vigor of intellect, the light of heaven it may be beaming on the inward eye, hath triumphed over the ills of the body. Oh, leave the sick man his books; leave him his lofty thoughts; his hope that even in this seclusion he is not wholly useless; his strong will, his upward aspirations."—P. 111.

After this passage there follows a reminiscence in illustration of it, which brought forcibly to our mind the late Edgar Taylor battling with and subduing the pangs of a severe ailment by resolutely devoting his time and thoughts to a critical translation of the New Testament. It is possible our author refers to this excellent man. If not, the two instances are in many respects parallel.

"I remember some years ago visiting often an excellent man who had long been suffering severely, and whose age left small hope that he would ever recover health. He was wise enough to seek mental recreation,—good enough to seek such as gave him peace and hope; nor shall I easily forget the animation which lighted up his pale face as he talked of his favorite pursuit. He had undertaken a critical translation of the Gospels, and his delight when he could throw any new light on an obscure passage was boundless. I asked him once how soon he should finish his work. 'Never,' was his answer; 'had I other pressing business to attend to, I might conclude this; but now, what can I have so soothing * as this blessed book always before my eyes? The desire to make my rendering more perfect, gives a definite object and a zest to all my other reading, and I am amused without losing sight of what I love. A work of fiction may serve to divert an hour for a fellow that hath never had an ache in his shoulder, but to one who hath little to enjoy in life save the hope of quitting it, there is no book like this. All others pall and weary, excepting as they connect themselves with the great end of man's being and the foundation of his expectations. I sleep quietly when I finish the day in such guise.' By thus giving, as he himself expressed it, a definite object to his excursive reading, it gained a sufficient interest to render the mind active.

* This will remind some readers of a beautiful passage in the Preface of Mr. Taylor's New Testament:—"The repeated revisions of his MS. have been found to be a resource of no ordinary value, under circumstances of painful interest to him, in which the weary spirit was glad to find relief under its burdens; and where better than in lingering by the fountains of living waters?"—*The New Testament*, &c. by a Layman, p. v.

History, travels, philology, all bore in some way on his pursuit; and it was pleasant to see the joyful and triumphant air with which he would sometimes hold up to me a book he had just purchased, exclaiming, 'I shall find something here for my work.' To the day of his death he never ceased to retouch his darling translation."—Pp. 111, 112.

We must not close our notice of this pleasant little book without remonstrating with the author for putting himself, as he has done, in fetters by assuming the title and style of *Thomas Brown, whilome Knt. and M. D.* He is too much in earnest always to think of his assumed character. The style is therefore incongruous. He begins with archaisms and quaintnesses suitable enough to his assumed character, but warms with his subject, and writes forthwith as a well-educated man would do "in the year of grace, 1845." We could find in every second page some word or phrase which Dr. Thomas Brown would never have used; e. g. that ugly Americanism, which every speech-maker at a Mechanics' Institute, and every writer in the "People's Journal," loves to use, and to which some of our own writers give countenance, EN-LIGHT-EN-MENT. We doubt whether he could quote from his prototype such phrases as "curative process," "intellectual incapacity," "development," &c.

The Statesmen of America in 1846. By SARAH MYTTON MAURY. Post 8vo. Pp. 548. London: Longman.

IF an American lady were to visit this country, and to write a book professing to describe the Statesmen of England in 1847, and were to represent Lord Brougham as a pattern statesman in consistency and calm dignity, Mr. Roebuck as a man of the sweetest temper, Lord George Bentinck as possessed of profound wisdom and enlarged and

statesmanlike views, and were also to add that Ireland is the glory of the empire, and the Irish well fed, contented and happy, she would scarcely surpass in strangeness this work of our countrywoman, Mrs. Maury. But we have always held the doctrine that there is no man and no book so utterly bad that something may not be learnt from it. The use to which this book of Mrs. Maury's may be turned is to exhibit to us all the worst principles and most baneful prejudices of the American people. We do not intend to waste our own time or our readers' by further criticism on this singular book. But, to show that our remarks are but too well founded, we will extract this lady's defence of—nay, warm panegyric on, American Slavery,—a subject which has recently occupied many of our pages, and on which our readers doubtless hold very definite opinions. The extract is taken from the chapter devoted to Mr. Calhoun, *in all whose doctrines* the authoress declares herself *his avowed and admiring disciple.*

"Mr. Calhoun is the determined upholder of *the existing system of Slavery and of Slave-holding rights;* his opinions are founded upon constitutional and legal government acts; upon the rights of property; upon the necessity of Slave labor in certain sections of the Union; upon the balance of power between the several states; upon the prosperity and means of life of the white population; and, lastly, *upon the welfare, happiness and existence of the* SLAVE; *for Calhoun loves his Slave.* He would not yield his faithful, affectionate, born, hereditary *Slave* and friend to the tender mercies of either American or English Abolitionists. And here let me say a few words on the merits of the Slave-holder in general; of him whom the Abolitionists would sweep away from the face of nations, because he is the guardian of more rights and feelings than they can understand, the source of more happiness to a greater number of men, women and

children, than all their Pharisaical sentiment could imagine. He watches his Slaves in their sickness; provides for their hunger, thirst and age; protects their wives and nourishes their children; addresses them with kindness, reproves their faults and punishes their vices; like the patriarchs of old, he is the father as well as the master of his people; and I candidly and boldly say, that I have never seen the masters of free white men behave towards them so justly or so mercifully, so familiarly, so confidingly, as the Slave-owner behaves to those who are his property. The fanatics (I beg their pardon—the philanthropists) who preach Emancipation, would they succor the liberated Slave? Would they share with him, his wife and children, the growth of their fields, the produce of their farms? They shrink from the responsibility of providing for him, though not from the responsibility of ruining him. Not one practical remedy have the whole posse of Abolitionists ever conceived in their united wisdom. * * *

"By the universal acknowledgment of the Abolitionists themselves, the Slaves of the United States are the happiest of all the laboring classes upon the face of the earth; the best fed, best clothed, and least oppressed with work. * * * It is acknowledged, then, that poverty and privation are the inheritance of all the serving classes in the world, the American Slave alone excepted; then why, I would solemnly ask of you, vain-glorious, hollow and pretended advocates of liberty, why, in the name of that remnant of contented bondsmen, why do you perplex yourselves and them? For Heaven's fair sake, leave these Negroes, the few remaining happy laborers who yet exist, to eat the bread of peace, and to dance and sing in the groves which they have planted."—Pp. 362–366.

We blush in transcribing these disgraceful sentiments, to think that they were penned by a woman and the mother of "eight sons in England." It is well that her purposes are to emigrate for life to America. England, thank God! is not the soil where such sentiments can live undisturbed.

[From the London Inquirer, No. 244.]

A Letter to the Right Hon. William Lord Heytesbury, G. C. B., &c. &c., upon the recent Burial Case in the Parish of Warminster. From the Vicar. Warminster: printed by W. H. Tayler.

The Rev. Arthur Fane, Vicar of Warminster, has obtained an unenviable notoriety by his conduct in the late burial case, and the letter before us abundantly displays the same intense bigotry which his communications with the family of the deceased Sarah Garrett, whom he describes as *sextoness to the Socinian meeting-house*, have made familiar to the readers of newspapers. Lord Heytesbury, though a Churchman, and by no means conspicuous for liberal politics, had taken a part decidedly opposed to Mr. Fane, who, therefore, addresses to him his defence of himself.

The only interest we have in this pamphlet is, as a display of the state of feeling in these times towards Dissenters, and especially Unitarians, of one section of the clergy of the Establishment. We think it unnecessary, and by no means worth while, to argue on the subject. The few passages we shall quote, carry with them their own condemnation; but as we sometimes hear a good deal of the *mildness* of the spirit of the Church, it is right it should be kept in public view that Arthur Fane, and Francis Close, and Hugh M'Neile, consider themselves as representing their Church, and are continually letting us see, in one way or another, what we should have to expect, if their power were equal to their good-will towards us.

The Vicar of Warminster thus describes the departure of the Presbyterian Church from orthodoxy

forgetting, we presume, that the gentleman mentioned, the Rev. Theophilus Browne, having resigned his connection with the Church, in consequence of his adopting Unitarian sentiments, of which he made open profession, could not have been invited as minister to the Warminster congregation, unless the same sentiments had previously prevailed amongst them: —

"But, my Lord, here, as elsewhere, the withering effects of a departure from the only true constitution of the Church, were in due time visible; an able and subtle minister, one Theophilus Browne, sowed gradually, but surely, the poison of infidelity. At the first traces of departure from orthodoxy, the congregation had indignantly remonstrated, and at first the protest of the more earnest members of the congregation had been deemed uncalled for and unneedful; but the very declaration of their teacher's orthodoxy was but a fresh cloak. By degrees, the poison sank deeper, and, in another twenty years, the once orthodox Puritan community became openly Socinian, and their very service-book, prepared by this preacher, Mr. Browne, declared — That the Redeemer of mankind was a mere man, who did not exist before his appearance on earth; that Baptism is wholly immaterial; and, travelling through the greater number of the cardinal truths of the Christian faith, left a mere collection of Mr. Browne's articles of faith, instead of those foundation-points of truth, *without a belief in which, no man can be saved.*"

We will next give the Vicar's own account of his intrusion on the sick and dying, and of his charitable estimate of the state of those Christians who do not receive his creed: —

"Let me further add, that, in this particular case, I exhorted Sarah Garrett, I explained fully to her the scheme of salvation, and on bended knees by her side, within a few days of her death, besought God to turn her from her error, into the light of His truth. I could not conscientiously say that I saw the slightest symptoms of *such* conversion, as would justify me in saying that she so repented of the error of her heresy, as to be qualified for the use of any service framed for orthodox believers in the Trinity. Believe me, my Lord, no person can more earnestly hope that I may be mistaken in this particular than myself; but with every anxiety to seize the least ground for

believing that she died in the Christian faith, I had no such *outward* testimony as would satisfy an impartial and conscientious mind."

We think the following passage very instructive. The canons of the Church are, according to Mr. Fane, to be, through all time, administered in the spirit of those who framed them. What else is needed to show that there is safety only in the total overthrow of a Church which has such foundations?

"When the Reformation purged the Church from the incrustation of error and superstition, which time and Rome had congealed around her, she selected certain laws and canons for the guidance and administration of her polity. We can but lightly judge of the meaning of these laws, *the intention* of these canons, unless we carefully *consider the minds and the conduct* of those who framed them. Your Lordship need hardly be reminded that Archbishop Cranmer, who was more employed than any other divine in reforming our ritual, and forming the external polity of the Church, was the judge, and, so to speak, instrument, in *executing* Joan Bocher, *for Socinian heresy*, George Van Parre, and several others, for *a far less decided profession of unbelief* than that which the Socinian holds in the present day."

The following morsel is too precious to be lost:—

"I will assure your Lordship that, after some investigation, I think the Turk has a far higher estimation of the Saviour's dignity than the Socinian. The Koran assigns to Jesus of Nazareth the next place to Allah, whilst the Socinian treats him as a *mere man*."

If we quoted every insult to Dissenters, and every peculiar display of dark bigotry on the part of the writer, we should go much further; but we have done enough for our purpose. We desire Mr. Fane to enjoy the reputation he deserves, and to this end it is only necessary to quote his words.

[From the London Inquirer, No. 243.]

POETRY.

"*Then stars arise, and the night is holy.*" — LONGFELLOW.

OH, cancel not the sorrow
That draws me nearer thee!
Without its chast'ning light, my soul
An unstarr'd night would be.
Almighty! may my being end
With this loved memory!

As heaven's unsullied bosom
Lull's the earth-cloud's unrest,
So let the future passion free,
Quiet my throbbing breast.
My future, as those heavens, may be
Shrouded, but unoppress'd.

From trouble's darken'd waters
Purer faith's prayer ascends;
Fresh from the fountains of this grief
My soul before thee bends!
The sin-veins of my nature now
Some holier feeling blends.

And shall a sad remembrance,
A love of grosser birth —
One that the Saviour knew not of,
Or deem'd of little worth —
With touch of mystic potency,
Draw my soul back to earth?

How — now beneath thy starlight,
Father, to thee I pray,
That, ere this better purpose fail,
I too may pass away:
I would not that my spirit lose
This beam of heavenly ray.

To mingle with the gold-grains
That pave the courts of heaven,
Thrice purified from meaner dross,
My soul's love shall be given;
And, for its boundlessness, oh, may
Its errors be forgiven.

CAROLINE.

INTELLIGENCE.

[From the Christian Reformer, London, April, 1847.]

THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

In the month of June last, the following notice was sent to the Heads of the different Colleges connected with the University of London.

"Notice of Motion.

"[The Rev. Dr. Jerrard.]

"That all Candidates for the B. A. Degree shall be examined either in one of the Books of the Pentateuch in the original Hebrew,* or in one of the Four Gospels or the Acts of the Apostles in the original Greek,* and also in Scripture History.

"That with regard to this examination, the following regulations be adopted:

"1. That a Board of Examiners in these subjects be constituted, to consist of not fewer than five persons.

"2. That the examination be conducted wholly on paper.

"3. That all passages and questions proposed for the examination of the Candidates be submitted to the whole Board of Examiners; and that no passage or question be determined on, unless it have received the sanction of a majority of at least four out of five of them.

"4. That none of the questions fixed upon be of a doctrinal character, and that no questions be so

* "The particular subjects to be selected from time to time by the Senate."

put as to require an expression of religious belief on the part of any Candidate.

"5. That a printed paper be placed before each Candidate, having on *one* side the passages selected from the *Hebrew* text, with questions relating to the Old Testament only; and on the *other*, the passages selected from the *Greek* text, with questions relating to the New as well as to the Old Testament; and that the Candidate, without being asked any *vivâ voce* question on the subject, be allowed to choose whichever side of the paper he may think proper.

"6. That no answer or translation given by any Candidate be objected to on the ground of its expressing any peculiarity of doctrinal views, provided always that it be decorous in tone and language.

"7. That no Candidate be declared *not* to have passed, except with the consent of at least four out of five of the Examiners."

This notice was sent, among others, to the Manchester New College; and as no time was specified at which the motion was to be brought forward, and the Professors were about to separate for the vacation, they thought it expedient to express their unanimous opinion upon it, although they had not then seen the paper of reasons which the Mover announced his intention to circulate. A Memorial was accordingly sent in their name to the Senate of the University, in which the proposed change was objected to for the following reasons:

"1. That if its object be to enlarge the sphere of the philological and historical examination, the experience of the Professors leads them to conclude, that they already embrace a sufficient number of languages and extent of reading, and that to add to these will only distract the studies of the Candi-

date and unnecessarily increase the difficulties of preparation.

"2. That the restrictions and precautions with which this part of the examination is to be conducted, imply the imminent danger of its becoming an inquisition into the religious belief of the Candidates; and that the necessity for these precautions is an argument against adopting the proposed change, unless some great and unquestionable advantage could be shown to result from it.

"3. That this College comprehends pupils of various denominations, for whose adequate preparation in the studies prescribed by the University the Professors are responsible; and that if the proposed change be made, they shall be compelled to make the text and history of the Old and New Testament the subject of academical instruction, from which they have hitherto abstained, being convinced that thus alone they could effectually avoid the suspicion of exercising any influence over the religious opinions of their pupils.

"For these reasons, the Professors of Manchester New College express a hope, that the Senate will allow the examinations in question to remain entirely voluntary on the part of the Candidates, according to the plan which was settled after a very full discussion, and, as it is believed, to the satisfaction of the public generally and of the Colleges affiliated to the University."

The documents circulated by Dr. Jerrard in support of his motion, consisting of extracts of letters written by Archbishop Whately and others, previous to the former discussion of this question, and his own reasons, having been read and considered by the Professors, they determined, at a subsequent meeting on the 18th of February, 1847, to adhere to their Memorial. The 4th of March had been

fixed for the consideration of the question by the Senate; but the Council of University College and the Heads of the Catholic Colleges having also expressed their disapprobation, Dr. Jerrard did not bring forward his motion.

THE FAST DAY.

Wednesday, March 24, was by Royal Proclamation set apart as a Fast Day. This State paper is drawn up in the usual style, and betrays melancholy ignorance of the *Christian* doctrine of Providence. It attributes the "scarcity and dearth" to the "heavy judgments" and "sore punishments" with which "Almighty God is pleased to visit the iniquities of this land"—a lamentable misrepresentation of the ways of Him who "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust," and under whose righteous government the calamities of this life are as often sent in mercy as in judgment. The concluding paragraph of the Proclamation is particularly offensive, and appears almost liable to the charge of blasphemy, in threatening the Divine displeasure on such as decline to observe so miserable a mockery of religion as this Fast Day. We hear much of missions to the Heathen; is there not need of a mission to enlighten the minds of the "Court at Osborne House, Isle of Wight," which "on the ninth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-seven," gave authority for so Heathenish a Proclamation? There is indeed reason for national humiliation when our rulers vainly think they are honoring God and promoting the interests of religion by an edict like this: "And we do strictly charge and command that the Public Fast be reverently and devoutly observed by all our loving subjects in England and Ireland, *as*

they tender the favor of Almighty God and would avoid his Wrath and Indignation, and upon pain of such Punishment as may be justly inflicted on all such as contemn and neglect the performance of so religious and necessary a duty," &c. The Proclamation concludes in the usual way. We take up the words and say, GOD SAVE THE QUEEN from the degrading and presumptuous theology in vogue at her Court!

The Prayers composed for the occasion by "the Most Reverend the Archbishops" and "the Right Reverend the Bishops," are a fitting sequel of the Proclamation. In the Communion Service, the Prayer put forth in the autumn is again brought into use,—a circumstance which does not indicate exuberant fertility in the devotions of the Most Reverend and Right Reverend Fathers in God.*

It is with much regret that we remember that a *Liberal* Government is chargeable with the folly of this Fast Day and its Proclamation. The suggestion originated with the Member for East Kent, Mr. J. P. Plumptre, a gentleman who has his use in the House of Commons (as Mr. Macaulay intimated in the exordium of his admirable speech on the Dissenters' Chapels Bill) in warning those around him of the tone and temper which they ought *not* to adopt on religious subjects. He is one of a small band of *evangelical* Members who think with Mr. R. Spooner, M. P. for Birmingham, that the potato blight is God's judgment upon us for passing the Maynooth Bill! We sincerely hope that henceforth the Whigs will have the boldness to act only on their convictions of propriety, and will not timidly

* We would recommend to all our readers to peruse a masterly analysis of this Prayer in a penny Sermon lately published by Rev. E. Higginson, entitled "Calamities not Judgments."

adopt follies and mummeries at the bidding of men with whom they can have little sympathy, and whose opposition they cannot permanently remove by an occasional concession to their prejudices; whilst the attempt to do so excites an unpleasant feeling in the minds of not a few, who would not willingly doubt either the wisdom, the patriotism or the spirit, of her Majesty's present Advisers.

INTOLERANCE IN CHESHIRE.

The clergy introduced into his diocese by the present Bishop of Chester are for the most part of the *evangelical* school. Many of them are Irishmen, burning with a passionate hatred of Popery, and not tolerant of Dissent in any of its forms. At Knutsford, Mr. Taylor, the Curate, has gone from house to house, and where he found the inhabitants were Unitarians or sent their children to the Unitarian Sunday-school, he denounced them as not being believers in Christ. The Rev. Henry Green, the Unitarian minister of the place, has printed a very excellent Address to the Inhabitants of Knutsford, rebuking this imprudent zealot, and contrasting his spirit with that of the gospel. This Address has been distributed very generally amongst the inhabitants of Knutsford, and the popular feeling, we are glad to hear, does *not* sympathize with the Curate. At Mottram, in the same county, similar intolerance has been exhibited towards the "Christian Brethren," not merely by the clergy, but by one or two wealthy employers. The Rev. R. B. Apsland preached and has since published a Sermon on the subject of this persecution, which has had a large local circulation. Two sermons in reply were preached by the Vicar of Mottram on Sunday, March 28, of which he gave notice the previous Sunday.

The following letters have appeared in the *Manchester Guardian.*

Sir,—Knowing that there is no better corrective of bigotry than exposure by the press, and that you are the friend of religious liberty, I claim the privilege of stating, briefly and dispassionately, some circumstances which have recently taken place at Mottram-in-Longendale. In November last, the society of people who call themselves "Christian Brethren," but who are vulgarly called *Barkerites*, after Joseph Barker, formerly a minister amongst the Methodists of the New Connection, opened a new chapel and spacious school-rooms. In the schools, instruction is given, on the Sundays, to about 400 poor children, by 30 teachers.* In their faith and worship, the Christian Brethren reject all authority but that of the Holy Scriptures. The services are usually conducted by lay ministers. Whether right or wrong in their opinions, such persons are entitled to the enjoyment of full religious liberty. The success of the school and chapel has, however, given umbrage to some of their neighbors. The clergy have preached against them, and have visited their parishioners, warning all against the new sect. In this they only did their duty, regarding, as they did, the opinions professed as unscriptural and dangerous. Of this it is not intended to make complaint; but, recently, efforts have been made by some of the wealthy proprietors and manufacturers, to put down these humble people, by threats to work-people and tenants. The loss of employment, and of their cottages, has been held out as the consequence of their sending the children to the schools, or themselves attending the chapel. Not many days ago, a near relative of the principal employer in the district visited his work-people, and compelled them to burn the tracts they had received at the Mottram school. Just about the time of this transaction, the Prime Minister of the Queen declared, in his place in Parliament, that it was a most intolerable grievance if any persons were prevented from worshipping

* There are nearly 60 teachers.—Ed. C. R.

their God according to their conscientious belief. In the sincere hope that this public exposure (without naming the parties implicated) will stop the wrong threatened against humble but sincere men, I subscribe myself,

A Lover of Religious Liberty.

Sir, — My attention has been drawn to a letter which appeared in your paper of Wednesday, the 10th inst., which, while speaking of the course I and my assistants are said to have taken in relation to persons calling themselves "Christian Brethren," also states, that the tracts which they had left at the houses in the neighborhood had been burnt by the order of certain influential parties, and in the presence of a member of one of the leading families. I should not think it my duty to take any notice of this letter (especially as the writer does not give his name, nor, as I conceive, state anything untrue of me) except to remove *a very possible* impression from those who do not know all the circumstances, namely, that I had some connection with this proceeding. I knew nothing of this alleged burning of the tracts; nor could I have advised it, however much I have condemned their contents. I will not take up your time in stating the course which I think the welfare of these deluded persons first demanded; and would merely remark, that while I shall endeavor to oppose, in every practicable and proper way, the errors and delusions of those who so unjustly assume the name of *Christian Brethren*, while I firmly believe their actual position is that of *sceptics and infidels*, there is not one of them I could consent to injure, defame or misrepresent — not one, whose temporal and spiritual benefit I would not gladly promote. — Yours respectfully,

David Seddon, Vicar of Mottram.

Mottram Vicarage, 18th March, 1847.

[We do not think the letter which has appeared on this subject was at all calculated to convey the impression that the Vicar of Mottram was a party to the burning of the tracts; but we are glad that Mr. Seddon has thus specifically disavowed any responsibility for, or approbation of, such a discreditable proceeding. — *Ed. Guard.*]

Sir, — Your last Saturday's paper contains a letter from Mr. Seddon, the Vicar of Mottram, referring to a previous one in which he had been named. With that letter I have nothing to do; but, as a resident in the neighborhood, and feeling an interest in the success of the society calling themselves "Christian Brethren," who have lately built a Sunday-school and place of worship at Mottram, I venture to hope you will allow me to reply to a part of the Vicar's letter. Of the society (though he says "he could not consent to injure, defame or misrepresent one of them,") he writes thus: "I firmly believe their actual position is that of *sceptics and infidels.*" This is Mr. Seddon's opinion of his neighbors; allow me to express mine. In my opinion there is not the slightest ground for his unkind and uncharitable insinuation. *I know it to be untrue.* I know the leaders and conductors of the Mottram Christian Brethren to be, in their situation in life, highly respectable, moral and religious. I know some of them as orderly, intelligent workmen of my own; as incapable of scepticism or infidelity, and as unlikely to associate with those holding such opinions, as the Vicar of Mottram himself. I believe them to be actuated by the best and purest motives, seeking only to do good at a great sacrifice to themselves, educating those who have hitherto had little chance of obtaining such a blessing; and I do hope that good men, of all sects, in the district, who wish for the improvement and well-doing of their fellow-creatures, regardless of sect or party, will continue, as they have hitherto done, to support them, and satisfy themselves, by visiting the schools, and convincing themselves of the truth of my statements. I may add, that the names of the trustees of the building, embracing, as they do, some of the Dissenters in Hyde, are a sufficient guarantee that it will be devoted only to education and religious worship, and not to promote infidelity and scepticism. I have thought it right to make these statements. I do not intend to be led into any further controversy. Those interested can easily ascertain the facts, and draw, as they will, their own conclusions. — I remain, Sir, yours respectfully,

EDMUND POTTER.

Dinting Lodge, Glossop, March 22, 1847.

[From the Christian Reformer, London, March, 1847.]

RELIGIOUS ENDOWMENTS.

THE expediency of endowments in support of religious sects *out of* the Establishment, and the obligation of the State to grant them its sanction and afford aid, were much debated during the discussion of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill. Those of the Established Church rest on grounds altogether distinct. It would seem to follow, of course, that when the State has with the national funds established a Church, which, it presumes, comprehends the nation, it will encourage individuals in augmenting the revenues of that Church. And, on the other hand, it would seem also a matter of course, that even when the State tolerates a sect, it will not to that degree give its aid, that it will enable that sect to make an endowment that will operate as a continual bar to a return to the Establishment, offering a perpetual bribe for a continuance in Nonconformity. Yet actual legislation has not perfectly corresponded with these presumptions; for Governments have been so well aware of the necessity of providing against the excess of religious zeal, under the direction of the clergy even of the Establishment, that all the Mortmain Acts have their full operation in the Established Church; and the endowments among the tolerated sects have been suffered to exist, to the exclusion equally of the untolerated sectarians and the members of the Establishment. In the famous Lady Hewley trust case, it was solemnly adjudged that "ministers of God's holy word" could not be either Anti-trinitarian or Churchmen! In consequence of this libe-

rality, all the Dissenting churches throughout the United Kingdom have been variously endowed according to their respective wealth and in the measure of their religious zeal. By Mr. Smith's Act, which passed in 1813, the Unitarians were placed personally in a state of legal equality with all other Dissenters; but it was notwithstanding decided in the same trust case, that they held all the property they had previously possessed only on sufferance, and that because the law deemed it impossible that men should intend to endow an untolerated church. Thus they were liable to be plundered whenever the Calvinistic Independents could prevail on an Episcopal Attorney-General to become the instrument of their malignant rapacity; which, happily, experience has shown to be by no means easy. From this state of thraldom they were relieved by the Dissenters' Chapels Act in 1844; and it was then resolved by the body that had successfully exerted themselves to procure that great measure of protection, to raise a memorial of the boon then conferred, in the shape of an endowment, not congregational, but educational, which at the same time might supply a want severely felt by the whole body of *co-religionaires*. After a delay much to be regretted, steps have been taken, and measures are now in progress for carrying that resolution into effect, by erecting a College in the Metropolis, in which lay as well as divinity students appertaining to their own society may partake of the combined advantages of a University and a Metropolitan position,—academical degrees, as well as every branch of secular learning, being already within their reach through the London University and the University College.

We are desirous, upon the present occasion, of

stating what appears to us the one great principle upon which that institution must be raised.

The one cardinal principle of such an institution must be the recognition and admission of the practical rule to which it owes its own existence. The single argument which sufficed to procure the Dissenters' Chapels Act was founded on the fact, that though the founders of most of the Dissenting chapels were themselves what is called orthodox, yet there was something they set before all the articles of orthodox belief — namely, perfect freedom. As they had resisted to the death the imposition of a creed by the Government, so they would impose none on themselves or their successors. They themselves had bid defiance to pains and penalties, as well as bribes in the shape of preferment; and as they could not punish a departure from their faith, so they would not bribe to an adherence to it by making an endowment in favor of their own particular creed.

Aware of this, the founders of the intended College must make it *unsectarian*. Were they to do otherwise, they would become objects of derision and scorn. It is true that, were they to do so, they would have right reverend and right royal examples in their favor. They might cite the high authority of the Anglican Church, which claimed for itself an obedience it withdrew from its own lawful magistrates; and the still more illustrious example of the most subtle sovereign in Europe, who, having obtained a throne by means of a successful insurrection of the populace of his metropolis, was scarcely warm in his seat before he planned measures for rendering a second insurrection impossible, the fortifications of Paris rendering future barricades utterly useless.

We should not have thought it worth the trouble

to state at length so obvious a truth, if we had not heard from respected friends language, with reference to the projected College, to the following effect: — "I am a Unitarian Christian, and I will willingly contribute to any institution that shall directly and openly advance its progress; but I will take no share in an institution that pretends to be unsectarian. It is after an education so carried on, that the Establishment is perpetually enlarged by deserters from our body." Now this objection loses sight equally of the principle, of the triumph of which the proposed institution is to be a memorial, as of the momentous distinction between fixing doctrines by an endowment interfering with perfect liberty of change, and the entrusting the government to individuals of precise and well known opinions; for we beg our friends in the mean time to bear in mind, that while we assert the necessity of an endowment being strictly *unsectarian*, we by no means contend that the institution is not to be on definite and well-ascertained principles.

We hope to be excused, on the contrary, by another class of objectors, for declaring our opinion, that a great deal of absurdity is commonly mixed up in the ordinary use of this word. All earnest Christianity must be sectarian; that is, it must contain a great deal that is denied by others, who are also entitled to bear the name of Christian. It cannot comprehend all professing Christians, and can only include a sect, that is, a portion of the imagined universal Church. The man who says, I am a Christian, and nothing more, — neither Romanist nor Anglican, Trinitarian nor Unitarian, &c. &c., for there must be many such antitheses, — we should be sorry to incur the reproach of illiberality or arrogance; but of such a man, we beg to be excused saying, that we think he is either masking unbelief

under words implying a catholic spirit, or that he does not know what he means.

We therefore beg these friends to bear in mind, that though the institution in prospect cannot be established *for* Unitarians, yet in the nature of things it cannot but be the institution *of* Unitarians. The founders of such a College will nominate the Council, who will appoint the teachers. It may be said, You know what they will teach, but not what they will continue to teach. Of course not; but to reply to this, would be to repeat all we have said. So strongly do we feel that this is all that ought to be done, that we acknowledge that we should have not been dissatisfied, if, after the Roman Catholic Emancipation had taken place, and the more difficult question of endowments arose, the Government had held the following language — "We will take no cognizance of any other Christianity than that which the law recognizes; but we will allow all to institute for themselves any church they like, and endow it with what property they like, provided they do not proclaim any doctrines hostile to the temporal interests of society, and subject to such Mortmain laws as the Established Church submits to. It is enough that they have made a provision for religious worship, and whatever they call religion shall be considered as such." Under an impartial and universally operating law framed upon such a practical maxim, each sect would be alike obliged to sustain itself by the vital energy of its members; none would derive an adventitious aid from wealth; and the present condition of the Dissenting congregations would be advantageously changed. Now, the minister is chosen because he is able to conform with an anciently prescribed creed, to which there may be attached an endowment; and the larger that is, so much the worse. Then the doctrine would

be determined by the concurrent will of people and minister, and thus the interests of truth would be best served. A bar set up in the way of progress and amelioration would be removed; an indolent acquiescence in formularies would give way to the intelligent consideration of doctrines which, being without the authority of prescription, must be submitted to the calm reason of the members. Nonconformists would then present a more creditable contrast to the members of the Establishment than now subsists. At present, the Churchman and the orthodox Dissenter submit alike to authority — the one, to the authority of the State; the other, to that of a knot of divines appertaining to a past age, honorable for an heroical resistance to persecution, but certainly having no superiority over the clergy of the Establishment, of that or any other age, for learning or rationality, all alike being deprived of the power of free inquiry.

How these strictures bear on the broader and more important question of Church Establishments, which, however, calls for the admission of many other elements, we leave to the consideration of our readers.

H. C. R.

[From the Christian Reformer, London, March, 1847.]

ASPLAND'S SERMONS.*

It has become a fashion in these days to speak lightly of the character and influence of sermons.

* Sermons on various Subjects, chiefly Practical. By the late Robert Aspland, Minister of the New Gravel-Pit Chapel, Hackney. Pp. 482. London—Chapman, Brothers, Newgate Street. 1847.

This is, in our opinion, far from being a good fashion. When we call to mind the many hours of intellectual and moral pleasure which that species of composition has afforded to us, we feel no inclination to envy those who regard themselves as elevated above the delight we have experienced. There are sermons which we should class among the finest productions of human genius; and there is no department of literature in which a more lavish expenditure of spiritual power can be found, than in that to which they belong. How often have we, in our solitary study, been carried far away from all consciousness of present things by the force of profound thought and impassioned eloquence to which, when exerted by the preacher himself, assembled multitudes had before implicitly yielded as with the heart of one man! The mere history of sermons would present a field of contemplation upon which the mind might profitably employ itself; and would prove no less honorable to the character of the authors of them, than interesting in its description of their effects upon society.

Still it is true that sermons have lost much of the influence which they formerly possessed. The preacher does not, in the present day, occupy any thing like the commanding position which he did in days gone by. He is often made painfully to feel that mere toleration, as distinguished from cordial co-operation, is all which his most laborious efforts can gain from those among whom his work is performed. The blame may be in a great measure his own. He may have dissociated himself from the sympathies of the present generation, by dwelling too exclusively among the forms in which Christian truth manifested itself to a departed age. That, we think, is the main fault attributable to the order to which he belongs. But this and such like

faults on his part will not account for some of the most striking of the peculiarities by which the inferiority of his social position is accompanied. The most important circumstance bearing upon that inferiority lies elsewhere. Our ancestors were more powerfully affected by sermons than we are, because they were, in a sense and a degree in which we are not, believers in that about which sermons concern themselves. It is this substantial difference between them and us — not any difference relating merely to the form of things — that supplies the only satisfactory explanation of the change which has occurred. Look at the character of the sermons which were wont to be admired in past times. They embraced a solid, thorough discussion of the topics on which they professed to treat — such a discussion as a man always seeks for in the case of a subject to which he is really attached. This, or the attempt at this, was their principal characteristic. Now it is just this mode of treating religious subjects from which the hearers of the present day shrink. They do not require the preacher to produce any thing of the nature of a profound investigation. That would only increase the evil of which they complain. Their requirement, indeed, is almost an opposite one. It is desired that labored thought, and extended research, and decided statement, should be as far as possible omitted, and that their place should be supplied by ardent appeals to the feelings. The smallness of the amount of truth enunciated, and even the looseness attaching to its statement, are considered to be matters of scarcely any importance in comparison with the immediate effect to be produced upon the sympathies of the heart. Excitement, and not instruction, is frequently stated, and still more generally regarded, to be the true object of preaching. The principle to which this state

things owes its origin, cannot be mistaken. It is plainly revealed by the nature of the circumstances it has produced. That principle is unbelief—not the resolute denial which sets itself in opposition to Christianity, but the sentimental scepticism which would fain possess all the moral advantages of the gospel without adopting any fixed opinion as to the reality of the facts on which that gospel is based. The evil we have just pointed out seems to us to affect, more, or less, all sections of the Christian church; but there are some considerations in favor of a probability that Unitarians are peculiarly exposed to its influence. Unitarianism is an unpopular faith, which the present generation of its professed adherents have rather derived from their parents, than adopted in the independent exercise of their own minds. The generation that preceded them could well resist the popular current they had to stem, by virtue of the strong conviction connected with their adoption of new opinions. Their descendants have to withstand the same current under circumstances which have naturally produced a diminished interest in the questions to which the resistance relates. It thus comes to pass, that many of them are tempted to seek an escape from their painful position under cover of a vague persuasion that the spirit of Christianity may be fully cultivated, though the formation of any decided judgment on disputed points of doctrine should be carefully avoided. We can only say of the persons who may yield to that temptation, that the sooner they can bring themselves to the actual belief of the orthodoxy with which they attempt to strike up this dishonorable peace, the better it will be for the welfare of their own souls.

The views we have just expressed cause us to hail with peculiar pleasure the appearance of another

volume of the Sermons of the late Mr. Aspland. It is gratifying to us that, in these degenerate times, such a volume should have appeared at all. It is especially gratifying that it should have appeared in connection with Unitarianism. The name of its author will, we trust, secure for it a wide circulation. It cannot but powerfully influence the minds of those into whose hands it comes; and the influence it exerts will be altogether in favor of that clear, firm, hearty faith in the religion of Jesus which can alone infuse life and strength into the Christian community. Our perusal of these sermons has forcibly brought to our minds the scripture which says, "No man having drunk old wine straightway desireth new, for he saith the old is better."

The present volume will, we think, be found superior to the one published during Mr. Aspland's life-time. It owes its superiority to the greater skill which has been shown in the selection and arrangement of its subjects. It has been most carefully edited; and will remain a monument of the filial affection under whose guidance it was prepared.

What we are most struck with in the sermons of Mr. Aspland, as they are here presented to us, is the strength and fulness of thought which they continually display. They are emphatically manly productions. The author enters upon the discussion of his subject as if it would be quite beneath him to shrink from grappling with any difficulty it might present. He never advances what can be called a weak position. Even those who differ from him must acknowledge that he invariably dwells upon the strong points of the case which he has in hand. His sentiments are, moreover, as rich as they are nervous. They indicate not only great mental force, but a vast profusion of such force. Of some of the

sermons we should be almost inclined to say that each paragraph might afford the materials of a sermon. To affirm that they are of substanstial construction is not enough; they are massively constructed. And yet we cannot concede that they are too much crowded with thought. There is no more thought in them than what is needful to accomplish the intended design. The breadth of purpose is always in harmony with the prodigality of means. There is no loose scattering of ideas in order to fill up a prescribed space. On the contrary, the mere composition is remarkable for its correctness. We could scarcely point out a sentence which could be altered for the better, or omitted without injury to the author's design: and the manner in which the literary portion of the task is executed, indicates an extent of care in the work of pulpit preparation which very few preachers deem it necessary to bestow.

The intellectual power attaching to these sermons is particularly seen in the ease of treatment by which they are characterized. There is nothing forced in them. Their style is of that best kind which does not attract notice by any peculiarities; and in the accomplishment of their most vigorous efforts there is no mental straining. They manifest no painful labor to find arguments, nor any anxiety to exhaust the arguments adduced. The thoughts are not violently driven forward. They flow on in a deep and continuous stream, which plainly indicates the magnitude of the source from which they are supplied. We are never conscious that the writer is trying to think. He appears simply to record what comes spontaneously to his mind after his subject has been sufficiently meditated. What thus drops unpressed from the comb is virgin honey. This ease and familiarity mark the substance of the sen-

timents delivered, almost as much as they do the manner in which those sentiments are advanced. There is a practical, homely, paternal cast about the moral teachings which it is the object of the preacher to enforce, under whose influence we feel that we have not so much to do with the disciplined skill of an acute investigator, as with the intuitively sure judgment of a man full of wisdom.

The eloquence of these sermons is produced much in the same manner as the freedom from constraint to which we have just referred. There are in them many passages of great eloquence, but it is not brilliancy of fancy, or loftiness of imagination, which constitutes that eloquence, much less is it a mere collocation of impressive words. The eloquence is conferred by the greater depth and fulness of the thoughts expressed. As those thoughts themselves become richer, they mould the language into richer forms, and it thus gives rise not only to a feeling of admiration, but to one of solemn awe.

The writer of this article had no personal acquaintance with Mr. Aspland. He was never so favored as even to see him. He, however, seems to himself to gain almost as correct a view of the character of their author from these writings, as he could have obtained from an intimate knowledge of the man. Here are throughout traces of the hand of a *master*. This was one fitted to command. His clearness of view and firmness of conviction, his power of thought and weight of statement, must have secured to him superiority over others in whatever sphere he moved. We have no doubt that in all his intercourse with others, as well as in his writings,

> "He gave the world assurance of a man."

It is not merely an intellectual or literary standard

according to which sermons should be judged. The great rule of judgment applicable to them is that supplied by the Christian gospel which they profess to expound. Mr. Aspland's sermons will not suffer by an examination according to that rule. They are eminently Christian in their character. They are not at all of the nature of moral essays, which the words of the gospel are employed merely to introduce; but they set forth that gospel as the system of truth and righteousness which they propose to enforce; and they draw their chief arguments and appeals directly from it. They never neglect to give what their author regards to be the original meaning of the texts on which they are built, and in most instances they are simply employed in carrying out the Christian doctrine which is thus developed. No attempt is made to bring in some other doctrine under the cover of scriptural language; and when the text itself does not supply the substance of the discourse, the utmost care is manifested in preserving to Christianity its due authority over the subject discussed. No fair opportunity of explaining the records of our faith is neglected; and though few of these sermons can be said to be directly controversial, the controversial questions lying in their way are, with invariable good sense, met and disposed of. This is done without injury to the practical purposes immediately in view; and the manner in which the clearing up of a disputed point is turned into a moral advantage, is sometimes very impressive. We cannot forbear from noticing here the frequent use of scriptural language which this volume embraces. It abounds with quotations from the Scriptures, and they are chosen with great skill, as well as most happily introduced. They are often made to communicate a sudden and startling pleasure; and they indicate such a familiarity with

the Bible as could only arise from a more than ordinary love of its sacred pages.

The religious spirit breathing through these sermons, and which it is their distinctive design to cultivate, is that of a calm trust in the providence of God. This is the end to which the discussion of their varied topics is more entirely subservient than to any other. Such trust is wisely represented as our true support in the sustaining of every trial and the performance of every duty. We are exhorted to cherish it as our dearest comfort in all the changing circumstances of life, and to employ it as the basis of a joyful hope in every conjuncture of the general affairs of the world. This comprised, in our author's estimation, the sum and substance of practical religion; and the temper of steady piety which it was calculated to produce, was to his mind the perfect realization of the Christian character. This religious faith is connected by him with a constant reference to the moral order of nature, and the benevolent design running through all the appointments of the Great Governor of the universe. So far the doctrine taught on this subject has our most cordial assent; and we cannot sufficiently express our admiration either of the manner in which it is here placed before us, or the high purpose it is intended to serve. We discover, however, or think we discover, too exclusive a leaning toward those motives to religious trust which are supplied by the fixed arrangements of outward nature, as distinguished from the motives supplied by the spiritual influence exerted by God upon the human soul. Much of what we consider very important truth on this subject would perhaps have been regarded by Mr. Aspland in the light of enthusiasm. This seems to us to be the one fault, if it be a fault, in the views of religion which are here so beautifully unfolded. We would be unde

stood as expressing an individual opinion only when we say, that the doctrine of divine influence, as distinct from the operation of natural agencies, is not only taught in the New Testament, but gives a peculiar color and tone to the whole of the religious life which is there exhibited to us. That life is distinctively the life of God in the soul of man. The faith, the prayer, the love, the duty, the hope of the gospel, all appear to us to recognize this influence as the essential principle with which they co-operate. Trust in the fixed order of Divine Providence is indeed a religious exercise of supreme importance; but it is in the gospel united with the pious expectation and diligent use of that assistance from above to which the promises of Christianity relate. A believing reliance upon such assistance not only promotes a more direct and ardent piety, by producing a closer union with the Object of our worship; but it manifests itself in a greater vigor of religious action, by the stronger sense of responsibility it communicates, and the deeper consciousness of power which it inspires. This was the kind of piety which distinguished the men by whom Christianity was first administered; and though their circumstances were different from those of men now, and many of the promises given to them related to the miraculous aid with which they were favored, we are firmly persuaded that the character they displayed was really intended in all its distinctive elements to be the type of the character which the religion of Jesus is designed to produce in all ages of the world.

A volume of *posthumous* Sermons is to us a book of very great interest. It is so especially when, as in the present instance, it bears strong marks of the peculiarities of the man by whom the sermons were written, and of the circumstances under which they

were delivered. In addition to the pleasure we take in the discussion of the subjects on which they treat, there is a pleasure communicated by the effort we make to imagine the state of feeling that prompted the choice of those subjects, and directed the mode in which they were set forth. We speculate, too, upon the effect they might have produced on the various persons who listened to them as they came home to the heart recommended by the living voice of him whose most sacred thoughts and earnest counsels they endeavored to express. If we are conscious that he whose words we are reading, discharged the duties of his office under a deep conviction of the responsibilities properly belonging to them, it is with the most hearty sympathy that we follow the course along which he leads us. There will be much of an autobiographical character attaching to the sermons preached by a man who really employs the pulpit as the instrument of enforcing the religious principles with which his own heart is charged. We should not in many instances err if we were to attempt to point out particular passages which possessed that character, judging of them as such solely by their effect upon our minds. In instances still more numerous, the tone of the composition would insensibly bring us into that state of feeling which accompanies intimate personal intercourse with an ingenuous heart, though no personal allusions could be distinctly traced. How greatly are such impressions as these heightened by the fact, that he whose most cherished beliefs, whose holiest reflections and aspirations lie before us, has ceased from his labors! He has been gathered to the bosom of the Eternal Father, whose cause upon earth it was his one great business to defend and advance. The lips which uttered these words of truth and power are silent. The hand which scattered this heavenly seed is

mouldering in the dust. Each one of these appeals to the noblest emotions of the human soul was once instinct with life. A sermon is in this respect different from most other literary productions, that it comes into being and operation amid circumstances which throw around it a living interest. It is elevated above the sphere of abstraction in which a treatise composed only for the press necessarily moves. It is uttered by one man in the presence of other men. In its delivery, eye meets eye, and thought in the form of personal sympathy comes into contact with thought. Its sentiments derive animation and warmth both from the physical and mental conditions under which they reveal themselves. The social character of man helps every application which is thus made to his understanding and heart. The instrumentality employed does the work to which it is appointed by virtue of the vital energy that is mutually drawn forth. In the case of a volume of posthumous Sermons, this view of the subject forcibly presents itself, and adds to the influence exerted by the intrinsic worth of the book. Such a volume speaks to us clearly of the past — of a past which, as to the principal element by which it was formed, can never return. The assemblies in which these discourses were spoken are not only dissolved — it is not only true that many of those who composed them are changed and dispersed by the common accidents of life — but he who was the centre of the union has departed to be seen no more. These and similar exhortations have finally ceased to be uttered by him. An anxious curiosity is on this account excited in our breasts to trace, if possible, the results which followed such exhortations. We can easily, from internal evidence alone, discover the general character of the audience to whom the sermons before us were addressed. It

plainly consisted of persons of reputation, whom it was proper to treat as already won in some measure to the service of morality and religion. Little is done by the preacher toward raising the impenitent from the slumber of his sin, or producing that entire revolution of feeling and conduct which is required in the instance of a life hitherto devoted to transgression. He had a different kind of work to perform, and he performed it well. Strict fidelity toward those whom he was set to direct, marks each of these efforts for their spiritual welfare. They search the heart to its core, and expose the secret motives and intentions of men, so that we should think none could escape from their application. What did they really accomplish? As passage after passage submits itself to our reflection, we ask ourselves what impressions they conveyed to those whose attention they originally gained? This truth — was it felt as truth, or did it fall listlessly on the ear? This warning — are there any now walking the more purely and steadily because it was given? This attempt to vindicate the ways of God — is it still operating in the confirmed faith of those whose painful doubts it was intended to solve? These bright prospects, to reveal which piety shed her united beams of truth and love — have they, like the illusions of a dream, vanished before the light of common day? In such thoughts as these we indulge as we proceed from one topic of discussion to another — sometimes even painting to ourselves that very outward appearance of the congregation which seems most accordant with the full effect of the sentiments we are perusing — until the volume in our hand becomes as interesting to us for the fancies it suggests, as it is for the lessons it directly teaches.

[From the London Inquirer, No. 244.]

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

The Council of the London University has, for some time past, had before it the following motion: "That all candidates for the B. A. Degree, shall be examined in one of the books of the Pentateuch, in the original Hebrew, or in one of the four Gospels, or the Acts of the Apostles, in the original Greek, and also in Scripture History." They have also taken the very wise step of asking the opinions of the several colleges in connection with them, before coming to a conclusion. The answers are not yet all returned; but we may easily guess what they will be. Those bodies, who take care that their religious opinions, like their style of dress, and fashion of speech, shall be wholly fitted to the established fashion, will see no danger in the proposed change; while the Catholics and Unitarians, who are aware that their opinions on Scripture History and Biblical Criticism, are unlike those of the majority, will probably fear that their answers to the proposed questions may be thought very faulty.

As a protection against partiality in the examination, the proposer of this new rule further proposes, "That none of the questions fixed upon be of a doctrinal character, and that no question be so put as to require an expression of religious belief, on the part of any candidate." But he must have read the history of the past to very little purpose, who fancies such words can be any guard against religious intolerance. There have been times when zeal was less, and charity greater; when an orthodox examiner might have respected the conscience

of his heterodox pupil; but such are not the days we live in. To take an instance. Can words be stronger, than the rules of the British and Foreign School Society in the Borough-Road? that it was founded for the benefit of all Christians; and no doctrines were to be there taught, but those held by all; yet the orthodox committee, in its zeal for the salvation of souls, answers in deed, if not in words, that those, who deny the Trinity and Atonement, are not Christians. So it would soon be at the London University, if the proposed rule were carried. We are sure of the honesty of the present Council; but not of those which may follow. Dr. Arnold would have openly excluded Jews and Unitarians; some future members of the Council may perhaps try to do so less honestly. It may be argued, that there is less danger of such a perversion of trust in the University, than in the Borough-Road School, whose committee are men of a very different moral and intellectual rank; and this we readily grant; but the committee in the Borough-Road are not the only persons whose moral vision is, in this case, blinded by religious zeal. The Government every year gives them a large grant of money, to assist them in the execution of their trust. The Educational Committee of the Privy Council, with whom the control rests, allows Unitarians to be excluded from the School by unfair questions, and would, probably, allow the same at the University. In short, to give our opinion in a word, we fear that the day is very far distant, when we can trust to a public examiner, to question his pupils on the Old and New Testaments, without allowing them to feel whether they agree with him, or disagree with him, in religious opinions.

[From the Irish Unitarian Magazine, for April, 1847.]

LOVE OF THE BEAUTIFUL AND GOOD.

Oh! I would like to rise, mother,
When the dew is on the flowers;
And to wander through the verdant fields,
In the sunbright morning hours.
I like to watch the hills, mother,
With their changing light and shade;
And the forest trees, that wave aloft
Their dark boughs o'er the glade.

I like to see the sheep, mother,
And to hear their tinkling bells,
Whose silver sound re-echoes far
Adown the rocky dells:
And I love the cooling breeze, mother,
And the sky's ethereal blue;
The thin soft mists, and fleecy clouds,
Of varied form and hue.

Or I would wander forth, mother,
Beneath the noontide ray;
I would rest me by the waterfall,
Amid the dashing spray:
I should hear the warbling birds, mother,
In the branches o'er my head;
And the nimble-footed hare to start
Forth from his heather bed.

And oh! I love to gaze, mother,
Upon the glowing west;
When the sun has veiled his burning brow,
And calmly sinks to rest.
And I would walk abroad, mother,
In the silence of the night,
When hill, and plain, and stream, and tree,
Are bathed in silver light.

These are but earthly joys, mother,
  Yet they speak of things above;
And I see in nature's varied scenes
  A hand of power and love.
In the freshness of the morn, mother,
  In the radiance of the noon,
In the calmness of the twilight hour,
  In night's pale and silent moon.

In the mountain's lofty peak, mother,
  In the floweret's modest grace,
In each I view the hand of God;
  Through all, his love I trace.
Oh! these are blissful thoughts, mother,
  But I know more blissful still—
He has prepared a home in heaven,
  For those who do his will.

Should I never taste again, mother,
  The joys I love so well;
Should I never rove the hill's smooth turf,
  Or repose in the mossy dell;
There are joys more pure than these, mother,
  There are pleasures all divine;
When I pass away from earthly scenes,
  Such pleasures may be mine.

Then mourn not for me, mother,
  Should health no more return;
You will raise your hopes above, beyond,
  The ashes of the urn.
I hear a warning voice, mother,
  That voice is from on high;
It calleth me, in gentle tones,
  To immortality.

I. A. D. DUBLIN.

[From the Irish Unitarian Magazine for April, 1847.]

SUMMER.

WRITTEN IN JANUARY.

I LOVE the rich, blue summer sky,
  That God has made so fair;
When things too small for human eye,
  Buzz through the glowing air:
And all is happiness in motion,
Like waves that stir the living ocean.

Now leave me in the woodbine glade,
  With Spencer's faëry queen;
With Mary, dear departed shade,
  Or Wyoming's thrilling scene;
The dying Giaour, or Marmion's fall,
Or Harp that hangs in Tara's Hall.

When pensive musings cloud my brow,
  On youth and pleasures fled;
On friends who live in memory now,
  The absent and the dead;
On hopes that flowed like Jordan's river,
To sink in the dead sea for ever:

Then let me climb the mountain heath —
  It makes my spirit glad,
To see the smiling vale beneath,
  With happy dwellings clad;
Where yellow harvests crown their store,
And friendship stands with open door.

* * * *

Lough Cuan* amidst her hundred isles
  And capes afar is seen;
And Quoile through softest landscape smiles
  On bays of living green;

* Lough Cuan, the ancient name of the Lough of Strangford.

Where more than landscape beauty dwells,
As many a dear remembrance tells.

To joy in vain my harp I tune,
  Among these dying flowers;
The birds that sang so sweet in June,
  Sit silent in the bowers;
They leave me joyless in my dreams;
Like those who wept by Babel's streams.

ST. DILLON.

[From the Inquirer, No. 247 — London, March 1847.]

THE EDUCATION CONTROVERSY.

We believe that a really liberal and just system of National Education, would obviate many of the evils apprehended from the present Ministerial plan, but we fear it would bring with it evils of its own, more than sufficient to counterbalance the advantages it would afford. At all events, in the present state of public feeling, it is impracticable—confessedly and assuredly so. We have but to choose between some such system as is now adopted, and getting on as we can, by mere voluntary efforts: so convinced are we that if the thing is to be done well, assistance is desirable, that the question becomes to us, Can we obtain any effectual assistance on terms which we can safely and honorably accept? It is too late for any evidence to be needed to show that such schemes as Lord Brougham's and Sir James Graham's could not be accepted. The difference, however, between them and the present

measure, is very striking, and each must stand on its own ground. Our friend, Dr. Hutton, than whom there is no one whose opinion we more highly value, and whose general agreement with ourselves, which we have been aware of on many important occasions, we take as a high compliment, and a just ground for confidence, gives us this week his objections to the Ministerial plan.

We agree with him in such fear respecting the impartiality of the Inspectors, as at least to desire every additional security. We ought at least to have that which a correspondent of the *Morning Chronicle* suggests, that they should be all *laymen;* and to lessen the connection with the Church, the duty of inspection, in relation to religion, should go no further, *in any school*, than inquiring, whether the managers have their attention awake to the conduct of the religious instruction, and are satisfied that their views are properly carried out. There ought to be nothing, in the duties required, to make a dissenter of any denomination less fit than a Churchman for the office of an inspector. We believe Dr. Hutton is quite right also in thinking that the more the schools are trusted to local management (with efficient inspection respecting the secular instruction) the better. We cannot agree in condemning what we believe to be a sincere attempt to improve the *quality* as well as quantity of education, on the ground of the increased Government patronage. There is a danger, but it is one which belongs to all public institutions — to all services obtained by the nation through the intervention of Government; and though needing to be jealously watched, it is not a reason for rejecting a great good, not otherwise attainable. We might just as well give up our police establishment. Government

must be well watched and controlled by a free and enlightened parliament; but benefits, which can only be obtained through its instrumentality, are not to be given up, lest the increase of public servants should cause corruption.

Another objection, in which we cannot concur, is the direct sanction given by the Education measure to the Established Church. It doubtless recognizes that Church as Established, which, until we can overthrow it, every public measure at all referring to it, must of necessity do; but it carefully abstains from offering to that Church any peculiar advantage or special patronage. An Unitarian school, which complies with the conditions in respect to contributions, has as good a claim to the Government aid, and would be as sure to obtain it, as a Church school. The Government support has to do with the quality of the school, and the exertions made by its friends, not with the religious sect to which it belongs. True, the Established Church, being the largest single sect, and by far the wealthiest, will draw to itself the lion's share of the Government fund; but then it is to be presumed that the largest portion of the means at the disposal of Government comes also from that party. We fully feel the evil of sectarian schools, as compared with those which are mixed and unsectarian; and we admit that some abuses must arise from this source; but a national unsectarian system we believe impossible—not to recur again to the evils or dangers of a permanent and uniform national system. The present measure is but auxiliary; and we have only to consider whether, in the whole, it does more good or harm. By accepting what is given, without any sectarian condition or restriction, we certainly do not express approbation of the

existence of an Establishment, against which we are constantly protesting; and if the members of the Church who will not join us in an unsectarian system, will give a good education, even with what we deem false views of religion, to their own people, the nation at large will be the better for it, and the probability of the rapid progress of truth will be greatly increased. What we say, and all that we say, is, that some aid to improve the quality of the education given to the poor, and to increase its quantity, is very greatly needed. It would be best given in mixed, unsectarian schools; but since these would not be used by many, and are disliked by large numbers possessing great social influence, the next best thing is that Government should assist schools belonging to any denomination, provided only they be good schools, and proper efforts be made by their local supporters; the management remaining with the voluntary supporters, but satisfaction being afforded by inspection as to the quality of the secular education; and as to religious instruction, such as the parties approve of, being really afforded.

In desiring to see aid given on such a plan, we do not think that we are compromising our principles; we do not consider that we lend any sanction to the Established Church, or that we really endanger any principle of religious freedom.

[From the London Inquirer, No. 244.]

INGRATITUDE.

I saw a small and tender shoot just peep
Above its parent sod, while, round, earth fondled
In her sweet embrace. Grateful, it seemed to kiss
The mould's nutritions, which, in return,
Gave kindly sustenance. I thought how good,
How active in Affection's sacred cause
Must be the parent that would rear a charge
So weak, and so exposed to stormy blasts!

* * * *

Upon that twig I looked again, and lo!
A mighty oak, whose towering structure seemed
To pry the secrets of high heaven! Up, up,
Up, it raised its mountain form, till clouds
Shone on its head, a kingly crown, and earth
Lay prostrate at its royalty. Each branch,
Ungrateful, waved with scornful pride upon
The lowly sod beneath — that sod whence sprung
Such grandeur all. Each tiny leaf away
From slighted earth turned its elated gaze,
Trembling with joyful pride. O, Majesty!
If such thou be, how sad is all thy pomp!
How painful all thy pride!

* * * *

Now, mighty oak! I see thee now — and what?
A black, foul heap of sordid dust, on which
'Tis loathsome for the eye to gaze! Dishonored,
Into earth's low cells thou sinkest down, crumbling
And mingling 'midst what thou once would not e'en
Cast thy eye upon. There lie ignoble!
Ruin shall feed thee with her vile, vile dust;
That pride, created by thy grandeur, gone,
Shall gnaw thee now with keenest pain; Remorse
Shall, like some hell-born demon, haunt thy hours,
And scorn shall point her deadliest shafts for thee!
Man of Ingratitude! the oak's
Shall be thy doom. JAMES.

[From the Inquirer, No. 247. — London, 1847.]

A WORD MORE ON THE FAST.

The public fast has turned out as we anticipated, in respect to the character of the observance. It has brought out all the superstitious feeling remaining in society. Many men have acted as if they believed that God was very angry, and could be appeased by their going without their usual food. Preachers in general have taught that the present sufferings of the nation are a judgment from God, in the sense of their being sent by an intervention differing from the Providence which sends the ordinary seasons, and being designed to punish the nation for wrong-doing in some particular way, which many of them attempted to specify, with the result which is usual in such cases — the manifestation of their own presumption, spiritual pride, ignorance, and folly. We have before us various accounts, private and public, of the discourses the occasion called forth, and we can have no doubt whatever, that the observance has been mischievous and degrading. When we condemn the doctrine of Divine judgments, we do not condemn the belief in a Universal Providence, extending to all, even the minutest events; we do not condemn the recognition of God's hand in our sufferings, as in our joys, or the desire to learn wisdom from our trials; we do not deny that, if we had, as a nation, known more and acted better, our calamity might have been avoided, and that we ought to apply the solemn lesson for our future guidance; but we object entirely to any man daring to pronounce, that certain public acts have offended God, and that he punishes them by the immediate mission of famine and pestilence; such things we regard as proving ignorance and presumption, as misdirecting public feeling, and encouraging gross and pernicious superstition. Again, if we think we understand what has been done wrong, let us correct it, and, according to the order of nature, the evil effects will disappear. But the idea of conciliating God by fasting, and national humiliation, is too absurd to need exposure; and it is melancholy to see it encouraged and promoted among the ignorant, by an act of what claims to be regarded as an enlightened government. In such a case we considered it as our part to offer passive resistance.

It seems that many Dissenters have chosen to observe the day, making of course their own use of the occasion; the Orthodox Dissenters have generally done so, the Non-subscribing body in some few instances. Each has followed his own judgment; but we think the prevailing character of the observance justifies our advice to our friends to have no part or lot in it.

Acme
Bookbinding Co., Inc.
100 Cambridge St.
Charlestown, MA 02129